

# AMERICA

## A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. XLIX, No. 16  
WHOLE No. 1243

July 22, 1933

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

<b>EDITORIALS</b> —Note and Comment.....	361-365
<b>TOPICS OF INTEREST:</b> Our Century at Chicago by Wilfrid Parsons, S.J.—The Persecution of the Jews by Hilaire Belloc—The Opportunity of the Catholic Graduate by John LaFarge, S.J.....	366-371
<b>POETRY:</b> Moon Song.....	371
<b>EDUCATION:</b> The Honeymoon Wanes by John Wiltbye .....	371-373
<b>ECONOMICS:</b> The Textile Labor Code by Paul L. Blakely, S.J.....	373-374
<b>WITH SCRIP AND STAFF</b> by The Pilgrim.....	374-375
<b>LITERATURE:</b> Learning to Write by Francis Talbot, S.J.....	375-377
<b>BOOK REVIEWS, 377-380.....</b>	
<b>COMMUNICATIONS, 380-381.....</b>	
<b>CHRONICLE.....</b>	382-384

### A Lawyer on Divorce

IN his address at the Chicago convention of the National Education Association, Clarence A. Martin, president of the American Bar Association, probably jolted some of his hearers when he said that within the last sixty years divorce had increased in this country by about 2,000 per cent. If fraud, collusion, and other practices now prevalent, continue unabated, the rate of increase will be sharp within the next decade. Nine-tenths of all divorces in 1930 were "uncontested," so that Mr. Martin is justified in claiming that "we have divorce by simple agreement, not so boldly as in Mexico and Russia, but just as effectively." In most parts of the United States, divorce has become so common that, except in the more scandalous cases, it no longer carries with it any stigma of disgrace. Even the social disapproval which once followed it is disappearing.

In spite of the evil effects of divorce, noted even by social students who are by no means in sympathy with the ideals of the Catholic Church, the movement for easier divorce has become very active in the last few years. The opposition to this movement is largely confined to words, and not a few of these words are hesitant and timid. Instances are supplied by the refusals of the larger ecclesiastical organizations to take a stand squarely against this menacing social evil. Even when special committees appointed to study the problem affirm the evil of divorce, and advise the taking of a strong position against it, the ecclesiastical conventions and general assemblies content themselves, as a rule, with vague statements that mean little and bind no one.

In view, then, of the favor with which society looks upon divorce, it is not surprising that our legislatures have inclined to facilitate rather than to hinder divorce. Since

1930, at least two States have adopted legislation which provides divorce for all comers, practically on application. Within the last few weeks, the American Association for the Advancement of Science listened to a professor of sociology who argued that divorce by mutual consent should be legally established, as it is now practically established, everywhere in the United States. The opinion of this professor probably does not differ greatly from that of his fellows in most of our non-Catholic colleges. There can be no doubt, then, that public opinion in the United States is strongly in favor of divorce. It is true that South Carolina neither grants nor recognizes divorce, and in a few of the other States, the courts make a serious effort to prevent fraud, evasion, and collusion. In general, however, our divorce laws are lax, and their administration deplorably laxer.

The facility with which some courts grant divorce is frequently defended on the ground that many of the marriages which they review should never have been contracted. Hence these unions should be dissolved as soon as possible. That some, at least, of these marriages should never have been contracted is true, since many States are as easy in issuing the marriage license as others are in registering the divorce decree. The conclusion of this fact, however, is not that the States should deal out divorces more liberally, but that more care should be exercised in granting licenses. President Martin would demand the publication of banns of marriage, and forbid the "Gretna Green," or migratory marriage. A number of States now require "publication of intention" which, in some sense, is equivalent to the banns, and have restricted the number of officials who are authorized to witness marriages. General adoption of similar legislation would undoubtedly be helpful in reducing the number of marriages which are almost certain to end in strife and

the divorce courts. It is to be hoped that the local bar associations will find a way of bringing Mr. Martin's suggested reforms before the legislatures.

When marriage is stripped of all religious character or significance, the way is open to easy divorce. Probably most non-Catholic Americans consider marriage to be at most a private contract which should be voidable at the will of the parties themselves. Naturally, then, they are inclined to tolerate and even to approve legislation which accords with their views, and to condemn as bigotry every approach to a stricter type of legislation. However, they should be able to appreciate the value of legislation which tends to prevent the unfit marriage, with its deplorable consequences. Mr. Martin is right in saying that the effects of divorce are seen in the children who pass through the juvenile courts to become public charges in some asylum or reformatory. This consequence is not merely "personal," but an evil effect which for its own preservation the State is bound to check.

### Qualified Bankers

THE history of banking for the last few decades would seem to indicate that bankers who are qualified both by character and technical knowledge are not numerous in this country. That indication deepens into certainty when the history of banking in the large cities during the decade just closed is studied. The majority of these bankers were probably not lacking in character, and it would hardly be fair to say that a majority were simply incompetent. But it is clear enough from the court records that a scandalously large number were incompetent, or careless, or dishonest.

Congress has passed a banking act which will probably make most of the old abuses impossible by making them unprofitable. But this act, intended to regulate the business of banking, makes no attempt to regulate the bankers themselves. It is just as possible today as it has been in the past to turn a man into a bank official on the ground that he is a boon companion, and quite without reference to his capability as a banker. Perhaps it was this consideration which led James F. T. O'Connor, Comptroller of the Currency, to tell the members of the Yale law school alumni last month, that it was necessary to build up a new banking profession "into which it will be necessary to show expert qualifications to gain entrance." Mr. O'Connor argued that since examinations were required for manicurists, chiropodists, and for plumbers, "we should not do less for our bankers." Under the present regime, thought Mr. O'Connor, it was too easy for a banker to turn the legitimate business of banking into "security gambling with other people's money."

It is not likely that any one, especially if he has lost money through bad or dishonest banking, will disagree with Mr. O'Connor. There may be some difference of opinion, however, when Mr. O'Connor's phrase, "expert qualifications" is scrutinized. Is the phrase to be taken as meaning that the banker must have an intimate knowl-

edge of finance and of all its allied branches, or does it postulate as well the possession of moral qualities? Is ability enough for a banker, or is it equally necessary that he be scrupulously honest?

We heartily endorse the proposal to subject the prospective banker to an examination as to his knowledge of the technicalities of the business, but a character examination is equally necessary. That examination has long been exacted from the lawyer. It is no less necessary in the case of the banker—especially after he has become a banker.

### Recovery or State Socialism

IN encouraging the industries to formulate codes, the Federal Government is undertaking a task that as recently as one year ago would have seemed utterly Utopian. Even today we do not know that it is wholly practicable, and that veteran social observer, F. P. Kenkel, warns us in the current number of *Central Blatt and Social Justice* against the danger of putting burdens on the Government which, in the words of Pius XI, "are not properly its own." There is much wisdom in that warning. It will not do for us to permit ourselves to be hurried into courses from which we shall extricate ourselves with difficulty after the emergency has passed. If we allow ourselves merely to drift, Mr. Kenkel writes, without knowing really what we can and cannot properly do, we shall end in a piebald State Socialism which is more likely to stifle economic activity than to stimulate and control it.

Yet it should not be forgotten that one of the greatest merits of the Recovery Act lies in its plain affirmation of principles which Catholic philosophers, Mr. Kenkel himself not the least among them, have hitherto urged with scant success. It is cheering, for instance, to note that Administrator Johnson, in interpreting the purposes of the Act, insists upon "the payment of a living wage to industry," and affirms in unmistakable terms the right of workers to organize in unions of their own choice. No less clear in asserting these rights was the President's memorandum, attached to the code formulated by the textile industries. At the same time, Mr. Johnson pledges himself to "a square deal to the employer." As far as we have been able to observe, in spite of provocation from certain industries, Mr. Johnson has steadily adhered to the principle laid down by Leo XIII, namely, that at all times the rights of all must be scrupulously observed.

In the details of the administration of this gigantic recovery plan, serious difficulties will certainly arise. To avoid all of them, and to overcome all with success, would postulate wisdom and industry that are more than human. We may look for plenty of fuss and feathers and red tape, for brass-hat officials who, like the swivel-chair warriors of fifteen years ago, will think that they can win this economic war by cruelly rowelling the sides of inoffensive desks in Washington. There is danger, too, that after having stated principles of charity and justice, there may be some reluctance in observing these canons in the actual application of the Act. In other words, this Act is



not going to sweep us all forward to prosperity with automatic precision and celerity. We can only hope for the best, promote to the extent of our ability what is good in the Act, and be ready to protest when the less good threatens to issue in positive evil.

## That Federal Education Bill

**F**OLLOWING the customary warning of the old almanacs, about this time of the year we look out for the budding of another campaign for the Federal Education bill. That is because the convention of the National Education Association generally takes place in the last days of June and the first of July, and we can always rely upon some speaker with enough hardihood to get the floor to tell the teachers how sorely they need a Federal Department of Education, with a Secretary, and all the trimmings. As very many of these public servants have for some time been more interested in getting a little salary from their respective cities than in a Federal Secretary with \$12,000 per year, not much oratory was expended on the Federal plan in 1931 and still less, unless we are in error, in 1932. This year, however, no less a personage than Dr. George D. Strayer, of Columbia University, whose allegiance to the Federal scheme has never wavered, arose to announce that Congress had at last seen the light. In its effulgence, he had no doubt, Congress would soon understand the wisdom of a scheme that it has treated with scant courtesy for nearly fifteen years.

The Association has heard that story before. But for once Dr. Strayer had something of real importance to announce, and if opponents of the Federal education plan are not up and doing, it is quite possible that the next Congress will crown Dr. Strayer and his associate with the bays of victory. The Recovery Act, Dr. Strayer pointed out, has authorized loans and grants for school buildings, and the Vocational Board has been placed, with the Office of Education, in the Department of the Interior. This latter fact seemed to argue that the Board and the Office would shortly be changed into a Department. The grants and the loans were assuredly evidence that "the Federal Government has a stake in the education of all the children of the United States." The conclusion, therefore, was plain: a Federal Department of Education charged with the perennial duty of distributing grants and loans to hungry or avaricious States.

We do not see quite so far as Dr. Strayer, but we admit that he has here not so much an argument as a good selling point. The Federal Government has been making grants to a number of corporations and other entities, public and private, the railroads, for instance; but it does not follow that the Government intends, or is authorized, to incorporate them into Federal divisions so that these grants and loans may become an established custom. Furthermore, the Government has "a stake," to borrow Dr. Strayer's sporting term, in hospitals, jails, asylums, social centers, and in a number of other activities. The logical sequence of this stake is not, however, a loan or

a grant, and much less an attempt to regulate or control through the use of a faintly disguised Federal subsidy.

But Dr. Strayer may have some difficulty in gaining general assent to his plan. The *New York Evening Post*, for instance, attacks it with force chiefly on two grounds, first that once begun these grants will become an intolerable financial burden on the Government, and next, that it will most certainly enmesh the schools firmly in the toils of Federal as well as of local politics. To readers of this Review the position of the *Evening Post* is familiar, since it has appeared in these pages again and again. We quote it merely to indicate that disguise the bill as you will—and it has passed through a bewildering series of changes since October, 1918—the Federal Education bill always remains "the same old bill."

## Our Favorite Crime

**I**N the last sixteen months, seventeen persons reported as "prominent," have been kidnaped. An average of more than one per month is high, and some police officials think that the average will rise. They base their theory on the assumption that as Prohibition wanes, the bootleggers and their criminal allies are turning to new sources of profit.

It is a new source, assuredly, and up to the present, it does not appear to be much more dangerous than violation of the Volstead Act. In fourteen of the seventeen cases, the kidnaped person has been returned, with or without ransom. While in the Lindbergh case the child was found dead, in all other cases the kidnapers inflicted no serious bodily injury upon their victims. But the most appalling of the facts in the record is that in only two cases have the criminals been found and convicted.

That the other criminals are at large would, on first thought, seem to be an indictment of our inefficient police. But it should be remembered that in a majority of these cases, not only were the police not informed immediately, but all information was studiously withheld when the crime was finally discovered by them. In his "Mysteries of the Missing," the late Edward H. Smith observes that this practice is common. Either the relatives of the victim have no confidence in the ability of the police, or they believe that they themselves are better fitted than experienced police officials to deal with criminals. It is easy to sympathize with parents who have been terrified by threatening letters; still, kidnaping is a crime against the State, and the State is entitled to demand information which may lead to the apprehension and conviction of the criminal. That remains true, even though the individual most directly concerned may entertain no high opinion of the astuteness or honesty of the police.

To attribute this sudden outburst of kidnaping to Prohibition is, we think, an indictment that can hardly be sustained. It is more probably due to the contempt in which the criminal elements in this country hold the police and the courts. In the first six months of the present year, the city of New York alone reported 228 homicides by shooting. Some of these cases, no doubt, can be ex-

plained as justifiable or accidental, but not all; and how many criminals will be punished by death or imprisonment remains to be seen. But capital punishment is rarely inflicted in the United States, and it has been estimated that the average life-sentence terminates in about ten years. It is not strange, then, that criminals entertain contempt for the processes of law, and conclude that if it is safe and profitable to murder, it must be safer and more profitable to kidnap. The results would indicate that this conclusion is correct.

### Note and Comment

#### Topsy-Turvy Prohibition

SEEING that Virginia, "the Mother of Presidents," is somewhat slow in revising her Prohibition legislation, several cities in the Commonwealth have taken it upon themselves to dispense their citizens to the end that they may manufacture and sell beer. Of course, no city can repeal a State law, but these cities have done what is equivalent by announcing that the law will not be enforced within their confines. Before we hasten to condemn this evasion, it will be well to reflect that the Federal Government has adopted almost the same policy. The Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act, with the exception of the provision for non-intoxicating beer, are, theoretically at least, the law of the land, with all the force which they have possessed at any time these last ten years. Yet the Prohibition-enforcement agencies have been practically abolished, and the few officials who remain have stated that their efforts will now be directed solely against importers and larger dealers in alcoholic beverages. This simply means that although the Volstead Act is still on the books, the Government does not intend to enforce it. It's topsy-turvy law, but that is to be expected, for Prohibition itself was topsy-turvy from the beginning.

#### Spain and Germany

THE Madrid correspondent of the *New York Times*, Frank L. Kluckhohn, in the course of a little editorializing in his dispatch of July 7, took notice of a mention of him in these columns some time back. He says: "An apparently badly informed person recently slipped an article into a usually responsible American church magazine, stating that while American newspapers—and he cited instances—had featured the treatment of Jews in Germany, they had ignored the worse treatment of Catholics in Spain." The person who was apparently badly informed and who "slipped" the article into AMERICA was the Editor himself, and the instance he cited was the *New York Times*. Mr. Kluckhohn answers by saying that the person failed to read the papers carefully and to notice that the Holy See still keeps its Nuncio at Madrid, which is like saying that the treatment was carefully reported and that it did not happen any-

way. He points out, too, that the much-suppressed *El Debate* has been "permitted" to print the Pope's Encyclicals, which is more than Hitler would do; all of which may be true. The article was not a defense of Hitler, but an indictment of the press for failing to point out that Azaña's Government is just as much a dictatorship as Hitler's, with this difference, which Mr. Kluckhohn fails to note, that Hitler's Government was elected by a majority who knew they were going to have a dictatorship, while Azaña's was put in by a majority who thought they were going to get a democracy. Moreover, since that time, a point which Mr. Kluckhohn also passes over, the Azaña Government holds office illegally and by force, for it was elected to frame a Constitution and not to implement it or to rule the country, it rules by virtue of the Defense of the Republic act which suppresses the Constitution at the Premier's will, and it was overwhelmingly repudiated by a large section of the people no longer ago than last April. Mr. Kluckhohn himself has said that the Government dare not risk a general election, for fear of losing the ground gained so far, which means, if it means anything, that it would lose its own power and position.

#### Dangers in Recovery

THE Government, in its efforts to bring about economic recovery, has at last come to the crucial point. It is faced with three acute dangers: that speculation will discount the whole ground to be gained and even beyond, with the consequent effect of a worse collapse; that production will run ahead of employment and therefore purchasing power so far that a new "jam" will occur; and that certain recalcitrant sections of industry will refuse to cooperate with the general effort, thus forcing the Government to use its coercive powers, a thing it wishes to avoid. Sir Josiah Stamp, the British economist, though approving the plans, points out the danger of over-speculation, and says: "If what people think about coming prosperity keeps within the progress of industrial activity already achieved and its immediate prospects, then no harm can come. But if the hopes for the future dash tragically ahead of existing facts, then the effect upon America and the rest of the world of disillusionment may be something too fearful to contemplate." Unfortunately, Sir Josiah knows that this is just what the American people are most likely to do, and unless we ourselves are imbued with the ideal of social justice we will dash again into suicide. As for the lagging of employment, or rather of wages and salaries, behind production, this is what has been feared all along, with the great and very recent improvement in labor-saving machinery, and it is clear that General Johnson is aware of the danger. This is what makes all the more imperative a general rise of wages in every industry, so that the total amount paid to workers of all kinds may at least equal the value of the product turned out, except for some few industries where we will have a marketable surplus. If it does not, then we will have finally to



admit that our capitalism is doomed. In their own self-interest, therefore, the employers will have to see the light, and will all have to see it together. Some of them undoubtedly are dreaming that the old days are here again. They are not, and they were the ones that killed them for good. Is it not about time for the President to make another radio speech?

#### The Narcotics Convention

**T**HERE is deep significance in the coming into force of the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, that was proclaimed on July 10 by President Roosevelt. Observers of League procedure have commented upon the fact that the convention was ratified by thirty-four nations in the record time of one year and nine months since it was adopted by the 1931 Narcotics Limitation Convention in Geneva. It took twelve nations over eight years to agree on suppressing the "white-slave" traffic; and the second Opium Convention, of 1925, was not ratified until after nearly five years. Apart, however, from the importance of this convention as the most progressive step yet taken towards the suppression of the international drug curse, there is the new precedent set of the regulation of a national industry by international control. There is a painful parallel between the drug traffic and that of the trade in munitions. Every voice that has been lifted up in protest against the billions that flow into the coffers of the munitions manufacturers through their inhuman production of the standing incitement to war has, so far, been stilled by the reminder that there was no instrument of international law at hand that could be appealed to in order to dominate the situation. National sovereignty was supreme, and under its shelter flourished international anarchy, as a result of the arms traffic and international conspiracy against morals, through the trade in opium and its derivatives. However, much of the meaning of the new convention as a precedent in international law will depend upon the vigor with which it is to be enforced through the newly set-up Supervisory Committee, in conjunction with the League of Nations Secretariat.

#### Woofers, Tweeters, And Morals

**W**HEN sound was first added to sight in motion pictures, the resultant was a noise resembling the bark of a bloodhound or the howl of a hyena. Then the animal sounds were clarified and the human voice emerged, but in such a way that it seemed to gurgle out from the interior of a sealed beer barrel. Eventually, the sound of the talkies resembled the voice of the speaker. That was not perfection, however, and the scientists worked on until they were able not only to reproduce the human and other noises in the ordinary range perfectly, but to carry the extremities of audition to the ear. A new device called the "Wide Range Projection" makes it possible for the auditor to hear the very high and the very low tones. This device includes

eight additional horns behind the screen; six of these, producing the lower tones, are appropriately named "woofers"; and the two that emit the higher sounds are euphonically named "tweeters." The technicians are forever working for improvements in their instruments and forever are seeking new inventions that wrest the secrets from a stolid, inanimate world. New processes in color photography have recently been developed, and marvelous powers are being added to the camera. The technicians and the scientists engaged in motion-picture work have an ideal toward which they are continually aiming; they are seeking a perfection and they know this perfection when they have captured it. While the medium is being thus perfected scientifically, the story being told through the perfected medium is disintegrating morally. The reason is that the producers and the directors have no ideals, such as have the scientists. The fabricators of the stories told on the screen have no perfection of human conduct to aim at, they would not recognize perfection were it to appear before them, and they would reject it if it were presented to them. While the scientist strives for pure sight and clear sound, the producer seeks smudged morality and muffled virtue. The one has an ideal which the other lacks.

#### Is Civil Service Doomed?

**T**HROUGH a decision of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court, civil service recently won a victory in the city of New York, and the President has issued an executive order which may end in placing first-class postmasterships under civil service. In addition, "it is announced" that the President wishes to place the civil-service employees who lost their jobs under the sweeping order of June 30, in the new bureaus which the National Recovery Act establishes, "as far as may be possible." These facts do not presage the doom of civil service; on the contrary, they seem like victory. But let us not ring the bells too soon. Presidential orders can be evaded, and a court can be made to look decidedly silly by the simple process of abolishing a job, to revive it later, with a new name and other minor changes. Besides, the kindly wishes of the President have not yet been embodied in an executive order, and until this happens, the old rule of the victors and the spoils will probably continue to be enforced.

---

### AMERICA

#### A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

---

WILFRID PARSONS  
Editor-in-Chief

PAUL L. BLAKELY  
GERARD B. DONNELLY

FRANCIS X. TALBOT  
FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN  
Associate Editors

JOHN LAFARGE  
JAMES F. DONOVAN

FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

#### SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

#### Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: MEDallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

## Our Century at Chicago

WILFRID PARSONS, S.J.

**N**O politician has had anything to do with A Century of Progress, the rather preciously named World's Fair commemorating Chicago's centenary. At least that is what we were told at a luncheon of the Catholic Press Association by one of the local speakers, and there seems no reason to doubt his word. In fact, a day later I saw a letter from a politician regretting his inability to secure a pass for an out-of-town visitor, and his inability to secure any passes at all. That probably accounts for the deepest impression one gets of what the Fair is, a marvel of smooth organization and operation. In that first respect, too, it fails to give an adequate picture of the century that has rolled over Chicago and the world since 1833.

Pretty nearly everything in our world is there, with some conspicuous exceptions. But it is a dream world, with frequent nostalgic reminders of reality. That, too, I suspect, will be a shock to any visitor, and is probably an enduring one to those who planned and run it. For in a sense they were great artists—if one can be so bold as to dub Rufus Dawes an artist—and they had a dream which they have translated into fact. But those who executed the dream were legion, and who could tell what a thousand hands might bring, each working separately and alone, yet side by side? I imagine that nobody more than Rufus Dawes was surprised by what the Fair turned out to be, though he had probably seen and approved every blue print and ground plan in it.

This rule has one exception. The Fair was planned deliberately as a triumph of indirect lighting of large surfaces, and it has certainly succeeded in being just that. But that, too, has its drawback; you can see indirect lighting only at night, which means for about three hours at the Fair, and it must be confessed that in the daylight hours the result is less than pleasing. All those large flat mono-colored planes in orange and red and yellow and blue and purple are dealt with harshly by that direct lighting plant, the sun, which takes a long time to move around and throw angle and curve into relief. Anybody seeing it only in the daytime and going away would truthfully report that the dream had turned out to be a garish nightmare, injected into waking hours.

But see it at night, and preferably from one of the three bridges which connect the mainland (made land, of course, as befits Chicago) with the enchanted island (also made), and you will see as stunning, as fantastic, and withal as impressive a sight as your eyes have gazed upon. It is hard to recognize the same buildings that you saw before. For indirect lighting is an eerie thing. It makes you see only what it wants you to see and it can entirely cut out from your vision what it wants to conceal. But it is only then that you understand what those flat blues and yellows are for, and the curious rounded surfaces, and the squat masses of most of the buildings' real being, and the curious excrescences which

are almost the only decorations any building has: the three pylons on the Federal Building, for example; the sixty-foot thermometer with a neon light for mercury, which advertises something or other (I have forgotten what); the four general-exhibit buildings with their rounded blue shoulder on one side and a magenta, blue, and green thin tower on the other; the Hall of Social Science, with its four totem-pole-looking upward projections.

So it is perhaps unfair to criticize the architecture of the Fair as architecture—the electrical engineers have had too much to say about it. The result is, of course, that it is not our century that the Fair has brought into being, but a phantasmagoria that has curiously turned out to be what this year most wanted, and in Chicago most of all, an escape world into which you can wander and forget all about our own world. Which explains many things: the fact that while this visitor at least was in Chicago he felt curiously ill at ease away from the Fair once he had seen it first; and the other fact that so many have noticed, the light-hearted, courteous, easy behavior of all the tourists from near and far, and the almost "sappy" beatific look in the eyes of people who one knows are worried and ill-humored and badly behaved at home. Somebody said that the "upturn" may very well have had its beginning at Chicago, and for that you can give the credit to nothing more than to indirect lighting!

The eyes certainly have it at the Fair, all to themselves at night; but the ears have their share, too—in the shape of the largest number of loud speakers that were ever brought together outside of a loud-speaker factory with none of its product sold. There are 118 of them, beginning with the granddaddy of them all at the Twelfth Street entrance, and they are never silent and you are never out of earshot of one of them. They are served by 600 miles of buried wire carrying 1,350 watts, and they sing, talk, blare, and jazz incessantly. This is not so terrible as it sounds, for a physical law comes to your rescue, the law that saves people who sleep next to an elevated railroad: after an hour or so you never hear them! This is just too bad, for they are also to serve as announcers of important facts, the average ten babies lost a day, the twenty doctors wanted by name, and all the rest of the things that can happen when a hundred-thousand people get together on 424 acres. In eleven hours there I never heard a single emergency call, and I suppose there must have been some. If I lived in Chicago and my house were burning down I would never have known it in time.

But it is hard to get away from that architecture. One thing about it is certain: there is nothing of our century in it, and I doubt if it will mark a progress. It is too purely modern, modernistic. It openly denies its past. Honest building has always been functional: the decora-



tion or beautifying of it must be not an added ("meretricious") feature, but the utilitarian organs themselves must be spiritualized. Here, however, there is nothing in the actual building to receive beauty, only a set of low box-like halls. So all sorts of un-functional outgrowths are put on, and these receive all the color and light. That, after hours of puzzling over what is "the matter" with it, seems to be the answer. Of symbolism there is very little, except the three pylons on the Federal Building like airplane wings set on end, which we are told represent the executive, legislative, and judicial branches; but this is arbitrary, nobody would have known it unless told. It is symbolic, of course, that the immense Hall of Science should be decked out with parallel lines, which drag it down to earth still more, but that was unintentional.

From all this escape from the reality of our century, there is still another escape into reality itself in the Fair. That is the Belgian Village. Some genius took all the distinctive features of Bruges—Town Hall, Cloth Hall, church, canal, and estaminets—left out all the ugly things, such as dirt and smells, and put them all together in charming confusion, so that when you are tired of all the hard bright exhibits of our century's material progress, you can retire into—the thirteenth century, and dance and drink beer. Incidentally, you can see a picture of the Crucifixion and hear a touching lecture, reverently delivered, on the meaning of the Redemption.

Is that, too, symbolic? Must we go, in our twentieth century, to the thirteenth to find the Faith? Even two such countries as Italy and Czechoslovakia in their exhibits display an almost patent effort to exclude their own Catholic tradition. The Hall of Religion, with its Jewish, Mormon, Christian Science, Salvation Army, Lutheran (pre-Hitler), and Episcopalian exhibits, has nothing to show of the Universal Church. If you search hard and long, you will find nothing of the Body of Christ living in our world but the more-than-doubtful Chalice of Antioch and the Extension Chapel Car on an out-of-the-way siding. But then, too, as Patrick F. Scanlan said in the *Brooklyn Tablet*, you will not see any breadlines either, which are also a very instant part of the day's reality. If the century of progress is the world of publicity, of advertising, of newspapers, of books, of the stage and cinema, of the unreal world, in fine, then the Century of Progress is a picture of our world. And that is all the world the dreamers of the Fair have apparently been told about.

Is the answer that the real world of faith should make a serious attempt to enter the unreal world of the popular consciousness and dominate it, too? No. Let the popular consciousness go to the Fair, let it see a picture of its world as it has learned it from its public shows, let it enjoy a transitory escape, and then let it come back to reality fortified in the new belief that all this is a show, a good show, but a show for all that.

## The Persecution of the Jews

HILAIRE BELLOC

(Copyright, 1933)

**I** NOTICE that in a good many quarters individual Catholics are supporting the policy of the present Government in Germany toward the Jews. I wonder whether I may be allowed to make a personal appeal or protest in the matter?

My claim to be allowed to do so is that I have written upon the Jewish problem at length and frequently, and this in days when it was more difficult and perhaps more dangerous to do so than it is today. I published a whole book on it about ten years ago, which was widely read and almost as widely attacked, though I think the thesis it maintained was temperate and just.

I pointed out that the Jews were really a separate nation and ought to have the privileges and duties incumbent upon that abnormal position—but that the reality of the Jewish problem must be recognized and met. I said that if it were not, sooner or later it was bound to lead to disaster; though where the first outbreak would take place I could not tell. We now know the answer to that question: The first outbreak has taken place under the Government of Berlin.

We are being asked to support the general policy of that Government on the ground that it is a bulwark against Communism and that it is the enemy of bad literature and bad morals. So far so good. One may agree or disagree

with the thesis that tyranny is necessary when things get very bad; one may agree or disagree with the thesis that the Reich was unjustly treated after the War—with all that I am not here concerned. It is in the nature of party controversy, which I am free to conduct elsewhere and would never introduce into these columns.

But there is also another argument which is brought forward in defense of the Nazi policy, which asks us to admire it because many of its supporters are Catholics as individuals. Von Papen is a Catholic, and Hitler was apparently born a Catholic and I suppose baptized one.

This argument seems to me worthless. We do not judge whether a particular act is good or bad by considering whether the perpetrator of it does or does not accept sound doctrine: if a man kills another he may be doing so in self-defense and if so he is justified though his religion be the worst sort of heresy; but if he does so from malice or from avarice he is a murderer though his creed be of the purest.

I think we may safely lay all these pleas for supporting the Nazi's policy (which after all is not mainly our concern) upon one side, and simply ask ourselves whether, as Catholics, we can accept their attitude toward the Jews.

That most emphatically is our concern. As Catholics we belong to a world-wide organization, and the Jewish

organization and people also are world-wide; what is done to them in one province of Christendom does most emphatically concern every other province.

Now I confess I cannot myself see how any Catholic can support or condone what has happened to the Jews in this predominantly Protestant country governed from Berlin. I am not speaking of the atrocities committed—and again it may be argued that they have been exaggerated, that the Government is not responsible for them, and so forth. But I am here speaking of what has admittedly been done and that, it seems to me, is definitely opposed to good morals. Men who have passed their lives earning their living by their professions in a particular trade have been reduced, through no fault of their own and merely by the accident of birth, to penury at a moment's notice. How can that possibly be excused?

The professions of law, of teaching in the universities, of medicine and the rest are open to all citizens of the Reich, most of them by competitive examination, and when that has been passed by the ability which each may show in his particular line, the man who has had the ability to pass that examination was free to advance and make a good income in the profession to which he had gained an entry. All of a sudden, without notice, these men have been debarred from earning their livelihood. What plea can possibly be urged for injustice of that kind and of that degree?

I have a number of Jewish friends, and without mentioning them by name I may allude to one, who is high in the academic world, a very great scholar, to another who is a deservedly respected professor of art also in a university, to half a dozen who are good writers, including one first-rate literary critic, to a dental surgeon (the best I have ever come across) and so on: there are among them painters, actors, singers, musicians of the highest talent, and first-rate mathematicians.

Each of these men by his abilities has come to occupy the position which he holds, has founded a good home and is earning a good income, which he deserves to earn. How could I condone a policy which would condemn all these men at a moment's notice to lose what they have thus acquired? How can I call it anything but an abominable and barefaced robbery? Yet that is what has happened over the water, and that is what we are asked to agree with and excuse. To me it is incomprehensible.

What excuse is it to say that in such and such a profession such and such a majority was Jewish? The Jews attained their position in that profession in open competition; everybody knew that they were Jews; they worked under the handicap of their unpopularity (which always attaches to their race in that part of Europe where they lived, though it does not yet attach to their race in this happier society to which we belong). I should have thought that the proposition was elementary; when a profession is thrown open to such and such candidates, when they pass the required tests, when they advance in their careers after passing these tests, what possible right can you have to go back on your word and deprive them of that which you have promised them by the social contract into which you have entered?

But there is more than this: there are very many cases in which not only an implied social contract is involved, but also a direct personal contract.

For instance, I read of one distinguished professor, to mention only one out of very many, who had a definite contract to occupy the position which he held and to draw the salary of it for so many years, presumably with a pension thereto attached. Without compensation, without warning, the man is suddenly thrown onto the streets. If that is not theft, what is?

As it seems to me, particular and flagrant injustice of this kind affects not only the individual who suffers from it nor only the unhappy men who perpetrate the outrage, but also those who are silent in the presence of it. They themselves will be poisoned if they do not protest, for it is their duty to protest.

There is at this moment in which I write a test case being brought before the League of Nations. Many Catholics in England are attached to the ideal of the League of Nations, more perhaps than I am myself; others regard it as a futile institution which will lead us nowhere; but none can deny that it is an existing tribunal. And before that tribunal there has been brought a definite charge to be investigated.

A Jew from Silesia has claimed the right to appeal to the League as a member of a minority of one of the nations of which the League is composed; the report on his case has been presented by an Irish member (whether Catholic or not I have not heard, nor is it relevant) and his claim has been unanimously supported save for the opposition of one member of the League—and that one member is, of course, the representative of the present Government in Berlin.

That the League of Nations will ultimately be able to do anything for that particular minority I doubt; it has not been very successful in such efforts, and it will presumably not be successful even in a case as clear as this—but what answer can be given which any reasonable man will accept? Are not the Jews in the Reich a perfect case of a minority grossly oppressed by a majority?

Personally I do not believe that the injustice will be permanently continued. I do not think that the Northern German can get on without the Jew. The Jewish intelligence was the principal agent of Prussian success in the last generation, and I very much doubt whether Prussia will be able to carry on without it now.

But whether the outrage is to continue for many years or for few, an outrage it is, and I cannot but raise my own small voice as a Catholic in condemnation of it. If there is anything to be said on the other side I should like to hear it; but so far I have read nothing which, in common morals, can be maintained.

There is another case of injustice which should make us particularly alive to the outrage done to Jews, because it concerns ourselves. It is not a parallel case, still less an identical one, but there is enough in common to link the two. Catholic organizations have been brutally robbed in many countries and as brutally forbidden common civic rights. The property of Religious Orders has been taken from them without the shadow of an excuse, and perse-



cutting laws have been enacted forbidding them to teach. Why? There is no possible answer to that question except to say that the Governments in question (of which the two worst examples are the Spanish and the Mexican) choose to regard the Catholic Church as their prey and members of the Religious Orders as outlaws.

We all of us note, of course, that while a great deal of publicity has been given to the German outrages against justice in the case of Jews, nothing has been said (or hardly anything) of the abominable injustice done to the Catholic Orders. Imagine what an outcry there would have been if, say, the property of the Y. M. C. A. were confiscated by a foreign Government, and if no one belonging to or affiliated to a Protestant corporation of any kind were allowed to teach. The absolutely indefensible robbery of monks and nuns and of the Society of Jesus and the prohibition of teaching by any Religious Order has gone almost unnoticed.

We have there a grievance different, I say, but in mere

justice more violent than the grievances of the German Jews. Leaving aside the grievance of the boycott (and it is one which I have always emphasized and which I think it most important to hammer in) there does apply to both cases the same simple rule that they are grossly offensive to the first principles of morals. It is a plain matter of right and wrong. And since it is the glory of Catholics, and should remain their chief boast, that they alone in the modern world are fully using their reason, let us base our protest in the one case as in the other on the ground of reason alone. All such exceptional laws violate not only justice but the dignity of reason. And it is for us Catholics to emphasize that point. If we don't, nobody else will; for the non-Catholic world around us has abandoned the use of reason, and has fallen back on mere prejudice and emotion. Now we claim to be the champions of reason in these points of morals as in science and everything else. It is a true claim, but we must exercise it in practice to give it effect.

## The Opportunity of the Catholic Graduate

JOHN LAFARGE, S.J.

**O**UTLAWED though she be by the city's glare, there are moments when the orb of night ingeniously displays herself. It was shortly after sunset, of a cold March evening. To the observer walking east, the full moon hung precisely in the middle of the canyon formed by skyscraper walls, the left wall being the mountainous Radio City monstrosity. Right above the moon was poised a motionless Zeppelin, and a brilliant planet was in convenient conjunction. The scene was too fantastic, I suppose, to be in good taste; but no one except the moon was responsible for it. It suited Radio City; and it suited my own mood, for I was ruminating on another conjunction or juncture, that of the present crisis with the field open for Catholic graduates. And if one of these coincidences could be so striking, why not the other?

At the recent convention in New York City of the National Catholic Alumni Federation, the air was full of this sense of conjunction or opportunity. Four great bodies hung high in the heavens of Catholic life. There was the long-tailed, sinister comet of the economic crisis, gliding into our orbit from regions unknown, and detracking all our humble solar system in its eccentric path. There was the bright sun of the Papal Encyclicals, casting a fructifying light into the problems of the lowly, and a searing shaft into the council chambers of the mighty. There was the round moon of Catholic lay activity, particularly of the Catholic college men, developing rapidly into a noble orb from the mere slender crescent of years gone by. And there was a constellation of new and supposedly fortune-bringing legislation, with the National Industrial Recovery Act as the crown of the cluster.

The honorable President of the Federation, Judge Dore, remarked at the conclusion of the second evening's

program: "If we Catholic laymen miss *this* opportunity to get our message over to the country, Heaven help us!" But you could not fail to be moved by it. His Eminence, Cardinal Hayes, who presided at the opening session, let it be plainly felt how much *he* was impressed by the vista that was opening up. As the speakers on that evening outlined the scope and intent of the present legislation, more and more the listeners—an alert, thoroughly attentive group—were struck by the coincidence of many of the basic ideas of the present legislation with the most characteristic elements in the Encyclical on social reconstruction.

The convention, in its resolutions, took formal recognition of this coincidence; while at the same time it showed where the provisions of the Act fall short of ethical requirements. Following the recent Statement of the Bishops and the pronouncements of Pope Pius XI, the convention urged that "government in the fulfilment of its functions should assist in the organization of the various economic groups," as the National Industrial Recovery Act provides, but it added the words of the Pope that "such an organization of the various economic groups along the lines of their separate industries and fields of endeavor should embrace representatives of every element in the economic group." Although the Act was endorsed in so far as it sets up trade associations for the attainment of an organized economy, the Alumni insisted "that the conduct of these associations remain not solely in the hands of the employers but embrace labor and government representing the general public." Otherwise the evils of uncontrolled monopoly would recur.

This word of warning again set me thinking of that vision seen walking eastward of a March evening. Two beings, I imagined, might see that identical vision, yet interpret it in wholly different fashion. One of these beings,

let us suppose, conceives the world only as in two dimensions. He might be a mural painter escaped from Radio City. For him the moon is but a little smaller than the poised Zeppelin: the planet is but a Mazda bulb; the skyscraper is incomparably more majestic. The other, a thinking human soul, peers into the depths of space. He recalls that the moon is some 140,000 miles distant; the planet many millions of miles away: that the respective appearances of this group of objects, now in chance visual conjunction, are incomparably disparate. And it is this space-concept, this realization of the *meaning* of that soft-glowing orb and the prick of light near it, that gives charm to the vision. The thinking man—like the true artist—sees with his *mind* as well as with his physical eye. Yet how can he explain this depth of vision to the creature that sees only in length and breadth? His language utterly fails. Their minds work in different orders of being. And the three-dimensionist is set down by the two-dimensionist as a "mystic," a fanatic, or just a poor deluded boob.

Now in the economic field, it is Divine Faith, with its consequent ethical sense, that gives us this understanding of the third dimension. The materialist is essentially a two-dimensionist. Profit and loss are his length and breadth; and out of that plane his mind is incapable of escape. The falsity of his view is not in its recognition of the profit motive: it is in the *exclusive* recognition of the profit motive; its incapability to move out of the plane of material gain and loss.

Nor is Communism, with its apparent abolition of the profit motive, an escape from the two-dimensional plane. The change from capitalism to super-capitalism; from gain in means of exchange to gain in goods or enjoyments does not lend a new perspective. It is but a change of motion from angles to curves. The plane remains as narrowly limited as before.

The immediate opportunity lying before the Catholic graduates of this country is to see that the third dimension, that of ethical principle rooted in Christian Faith, is safeguarded in the coming national developments. Dr. John A. Ryan, of the Catholic University of America, speaking at the Friday night session of the Alumni Convention, put his finger on the nerve of the affair when he said:

I think this Industrial Recovery Act will not work unless capital gets a smaller share of the industrial products than it has been getting. . . . Whether capital will be satisfied, I do not know. But if you ask me what we shall have next if this does not work, I hesitate to think.

Still more drastic were the words of Donald P. Richberg, general counsel of the National Recovery Administration, when he told the Merchants' Association on July 6:

In his statement of June 16, the President said that this law is a challenge to industry and to labor. That challenge must be met in the next sixty days. If the organized groups of either management or labor fail to meet that challenge, they will be indicted for incompetence by the suffering millions who are now giving to industrial leadership one more chance—perhaps the last—to justify its authority.

Where will the contest be? The basic code of fair

competition, said Mr. Richberg, "should establish minimum wages for the hours of work as limited, so that a decent living may be assured to the humblest worker." It should protect "the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining for all employees." Also, "there must be united attack of all industries upon low wages and long hours, a simultaneous rise of purchasing power all along the line."

But this means conflict with the rooted two-dimensional point of view: "the agony of the hard-headed manager who has stood on his head successfully all his life, viewing the supreme achievement of a business enterprise as a reduction in the payroll coupled with an increased output, who has not felt the slightest responsibility for maintaining mass purchasing power."

Already the employers' discussions have revealed prevailing misconceptions as to the "lower standard of living," confusing the result of industrial and educational deprivation with a supposedly inherent lower grade of wants. Fears have been aroused that the old prevailing differentials in wage scales may be abolished: differences between branches of the same industry in different sections of the country; or dual wage scales for workers in the same locality, based upon racial discriminations. Similar discriminations may be reached by subtler, but none the less unfair forms, by ingenious classifications of the workers; as prevail, according to C. S. Johnson, among the women garment workers of Baltimore.

It was for this reason, and others similar to it, that the following resolution was included in the final draft of those adopted by the Alumni Convention:

Whereas the program of social justice, etc. . . .

Therefore be it resolved that this Convention of the National Catholic Alumni Federation go on record in advocating that the ideals of social justice be applied in the administration of the National Industrial Recovery legislation, with full justice to the people of every race, creed, and color without favor, prejudice, or discrimination.

There are evidences that the moral implications of the new legislation will not be overlooked, that there is an understanding, as Mr. Richberg said, that "the causes of the depression lie 'not in our stars but in ourselves.'" "The notion is spreading," said Postmaster General Farley, at the Convention luncheon, "that business and sound morals are one and the same thing." General Johnson and Secretary Perkins both lay stress on ethical matters. The Labor Advisory Board is to be congratulated in the appointment to its number of a man of the knowledge and experience of the Rev. Francis J. Haas, Ph.D., Director of the National Catholic School for Social Service.

Nevertheless, a few individuals, no matter how empowered or enlightened, cannot make way alone against the obstacles that must be faced. According to Edmond B. Butler, new president of the Alumni, "it is the duty of every educated Catholic throughout the country to take an active part in his own industry and in his own locality in the formation of codes and in everything that will tend to social justice."

The National Recovery Act needs for its fulfilment



the aid of men who have learned to think consecutively in terms of three dimensions instead of two; men who can recognize the stars when they see them, and not confuse them with street lamps. Both the Church and the country presume that the Catholic college graduate is of such a type. He is supposed to be the man who has learned to distinguish the flickering of an opinion from the radiance given out by eternal truths. To the worldly tribe, whom I noted in an article a fortnight hence as one of the main dangers to Catholic education, one light looks like another. All things are seen upon the same plane of selfishness; and the only light with a meaning is the green light bidding them roll forward to promotion. If Catholic graduates, as a body, were of such a type, there would be little hope for their influence upon national affairs.

But taking as representative the men who attended the convention, we can believe that such a type is the exception among Catholic graduates. If the spirit shown there will mark these men's action face to face with the problems created by the new turn of affairs, they will be a tremendous influence in the United States.

The task now facing our graduates, to quote again Mr. Richberg, is "to find a democratic and a truly American solution of the problem that has produced dictatorships in at least three great nations since the World War." The united action of American Catholic graduates, however, is a factor in civilization that has never yet been tried. No European nation, not even of the Catholic ones, has experienced anything quite like it. So far, even the alumni of individual colleges have rarely registered their influence in any collective way. But "if they hold back and waste these precious hours, if they take counsel with prejudice and doubt, if they fumble their great opportunity, they may suddenly find that it (the opportunity) has gone forever." Our bulwark against dictatorships is the ethical heritage that we enjoy as Catholics through our Church and as Americans through our Constitution. We look to the Catholic graduate to apply this heritage to the opportunity now at hand.

#### MOON SONG

The moon is a silver lyre,  
And a song falls from the night  
Deeply into the mind's delight,  
As I walk in the grass and listen.

The moon is a silver bow;  
An arrow is in my heart  
Cleaving the song apart,  
And my body is stained with crimson.

The moon is a silver sickle  
That has cut down the night-rose,  
Dead petals fur my cheek with woes,  
And the garden is without bloom.

The moon has gone from the sky;  
The arrow stirs in the wound;  
The harps are mute and untuned,  
And the night murmurs without song.

JOHN LEE HIGGINS.

#### Education

### The Honeymoon Wanes

JOHN WILTBYE

LAST month I ran across my young friend, John, and it was our first meeting in almost a quarter of a century. He is not young, really. But many years ago, before I discovered that not even the Dean and the grace of God could fill up the void established when nature bounteously withheld from me the teacher's gift, he was in one of my classes, and so I continue to think of him as young. He is oldish now, with a sorrow that only his Catholic faith can assuage.

He came into my mind again when I picked up my AMERICA for July 15, and read the story "Marriage: Mixed and Unmixed," told by "A Catholic Wife." This lady has written one of the most direct and appealing indictments of mixed marriages that I have yet read. Could it not be put into circular form to be distributed at church doors, and to be made required reading next September in our high schools and colleges? Most Catholics know "the law of the Church," I suppose, but one look into Esmeralda's eyes too often makes it as unimportant to them as the fact that the earth is flattened at its poles. They admit the indictment, but what of it? What are "dispensations" for? Better get at them (the young Catholics, I mean, not the dispensations) before Esmeralda's fluttering orbs begin their work.

But to return to John. Not long after graduation from a professional school he suddenly "fell in love." Many of our young people do, and to some it is like falling into a tar barrel. They can be rescued, but the stain is hard to get off. He was a good Catholic, she an equally good Methodist, and he had no doubt that within a year or two she would find her way into the one Fold. Meanwhile, the "promises"; they were hardly necessary, he felt sure, for she attended Mass with him quite regularly on Sunday. So they were married, and it was a perfectly lovely wedding, of course. Of equal social standing, they took their social pleasures in the same circles, and there was no *res angusta domi*, for fortune had dealt liberally with each. For a time, the skies were unclouded, but not for long. With the coming of their little girl toward the end of their second year of married life, her whole attitude toward the Catholic Church turned from benevolence to bitterness.

Who can explain these things? Was the change due to smugness on his part, to a word said out of season, to an unfortunate reference in a sermon? I do not know. Two more children came to a wrangling household in the succeeding decade. One by one the father smuggled them out of the house for baptism, to face, when the story of his iniquity came out, as it invariably did, a tirade that left little that could humiliate and cut unsaid. One by one he managed to have them prepared for Confirmation and their First Holy Communion, and then a day that should have been supremely happy for the household became a day of almost savage hatred.

Today, in order to keep the home together, and prevent a divorce in which the children would certainly be given to their mother, he has been forced to a compromise. Every Sunday the children are permitted to go with him to early Mass, at which they receive Holy Communion. After breakfast, they *must* go with their mother to the Methodist services. I wonder what these poor youngsters think of religion, and how long after they reach maturity they will consent to adhere to any religion at all.

As long as we Catholics form a minority in a people drawn from all racial strains, and professing every form of religious creed, or none at all, I suppose that mixed marriages will be unhappily inevitable. Not all of them mean the loss of the Catholic partner to the Church, or the loss of the children. If that result could be shown, no doubt the Church would forbid them entirely. As the case now stands, the Church, while forbidding them, tolerates them in given circumstances, just as in certain cases, she tolerates the presence of Catholic pupils at non-Catholic schools. But she never blesses them, she does not, except in extreme cases, permit them to take place before her altars, and she demands, as a minimum, assurance that the Catholic faith and morals of the Catholic party and of the children to be born be respected. Many a priest, as he stands before the young couple, must compare these marriages to some of his death-bed experiences. He does what he can, and he hopes that the infinite mercy of an all-loving Father will embrace this poor sinner who has passed into the other world with, at best, dubious signs of what may be repentance. Then he goes home, hoping, praying, too . . . but wondering, questioning.

No one would deliberately stake his chances of life everlasting on such an end. But thousands stake their married happiness on a chance that is even more slender. The mixed marriage is with us, an ominous symptom of disease. It will probably remain with us for some time; hence it is incumbent upon us to study to make it less common, and less hurtful in its results. Where shall we begin?

Unless we begin in the elementary school, we shall not easily find a point at which we can begin at all. I am asking myself, broken-down teacher that I am, whether we are doing what we can and should do in this respect.

We *do* begin in the elementary school, I know. From the bare text of their catechisms the children learn that marriage is a Sacrament. From the instructions of Sister, Brother, and priest, they learn much more. Of course, since marriage of any kind is not an immediate problem to these harum-scarums, they do not view the problem of "mixed marriage" with philosophical objectivity. But a foundation has been made, and on it the teacher can build. As a majority of our children leave school on finishing the eighth grade, it is in the last two years that the building should begin in earnest. If no more is gained than a persuasion that every Catholic, if he marries at all, must marry a Catholic, "before the priest," much has been gained.

But what of the high school and college?

I put that question to three young people, two boys and a girl, all graduates within the last five years of Catholic colleges. All, I fancy, are above the average in ability, good sense, and the practice of their religion. To a man and a woman, not one, although I asked them to tax their memories, could remember that the subject had ever been mentioned at high school or college, except through the observation that it was "forbidden." As far as they could recollect, however, the real impression was made in the parish school. All viewed it as objectionable because it might "cause trouble" between husband and wife. Other more fundamental reasons, they were not prepared to give.

Of course, it would be absurd to draw any generalization from three examples. But was my experience an exception? Are most of the young people in our high schools and colleges "opposed" to mixed marriage merely on the ground that a difference in religion between husband and wife may be bad, like too many mosquitoes, for their respective tempers? If so, then there is something seriously wrong, I think, with their erstwhile teachers.

Statistics are not of much use here, and I do not know that any are available. I suppose we may say, however, that not more than five per cent of our boys and girls are called by Almighty God to the altar or the cloister, or to a single life, with or without vow, in the world. Twenty per cent more, for physical, social, economic, and other reasons which need not be discussed here, will never marry. I have put these estimates purposely high. What is left shows us that about three out of every four of our children will enter the married state. If school is a preparation for right living, it should most certainly prepare for that state of life which a large majority of the pupils will ultimately embrace. Do we fail here?

In a sense, every Catholic school does give that preparation. The permanence and happiness of marriage depend ultimately upon fidelity and love, and a school in which the teacher's first task is to train the child to love God and obey His law gives the necessary foundation. Unless that is laid, science and literature and fervid exhortations will not avail much. But can we not do something more?

I think we can. I am told that in the high schools of a certain diocese in the Middle West, there is a regular course of lectures for one term on marriage and parenthood. The lecturers are the superintendent, who is a priest, a well-known Catholic physician, and the head of the domestic-science department in the local public high school. All the pupils are required to take this course. The idea of having the married laity tell the pupils about marriage and its conflicts appeals to me. "Sure, an' what does he know about it at all?" said one old lady to another, after a lecture on the subject by that prince of pulpit orators, the late Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia. Teachers and pastors may not remain silent, of course, but I am convinced that a straightforward talk on the unhappiness and evils of the mixed marriage will have more effect when it comes from an imported married layman.

Vocational guidance is properly, although not primarily,



the work of the teacher in these days. The job belongs in the first instance to parents, but it will be done better, I think, when parents and the school cooperate. Its chief purpose is to put the pegs where they belong, so that we shall no longer have boys as uncomfortable as Tiny Tim's brother in his high collar, when they might be gorgeously happy and on the way to prosperity as plumbers and

plasterers. But vocation is more important than avocation, and marriage is a vocation. Surely our Catholic schools, by sane and continued insistence on Catholic marriage, can help to lessen mixed marriages.

About thirty of our colleges now give courses or, at least, lectures on marriage and parenthood. That is a good beginning. But it is only a beginning.

## Economics

# The Textile Labor Code

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

UNDER the authority of the National Industrial Recovery Act, President Roosevelt signed the cotton textile code on July 9. It is the first of the labor codes, and is understood to have the approbation of the trade associations of the industry and of labor-union leaders. However, there is at present a dissenting minority of about twenty per cent of the textile operators. These will be given a hearing, but, unless some compromise on minor points can be conceded by the Government, they will not be licensed to operate. Should they operate without reference to the license, their plants can be closed by the Government, and heavy penalties imposed. The same procedure can be invoked against operators who violate their agreement to abide by the code.

As the other codes will doubtless be modeled on this first instrument, it is interesting to note the effects which the Government hopes to achieve. According to Dr. Alexander Sachs, chief of the research division operating under the Act, the code will result in putting to work 100,000 more workers than were required in 1929, and 60,000 more than were in the mills in the peak year, 1927. The average mill wage will be raised by about thirty per cent, and the average number of hours of work will be reduced by twenty-five per cent. The minimum wage for a week of forty hours will be \$12 in the South, and \$13 in the North.

What the Administration is trying to effect is an equitable compromise which will give the worker an approach, at least, to a living wage, and at the same time, keep the wage at a figure which will not discourage the operator. As Mark Sullivan remarks in his syndicated letter, Administrator Johnson and his associates wish to bring about, as a beginning of prosperity, "a condition in which the total purchasing power of the country is greater than the total of prices of goods for sale." Obviously, this means controlled production, and for a much longer period than the four months during which the code is to be tried out.

It is unfair to condemn the code because it does not forthwith settle all difficulties, even in the field which it directly covers. Perhaps the Administration would have been better advised had it checked, before the end of the first paragraph, some of the fairy tales which have become attached to this code making. The sum of \$13 per week is not a satisfactory wage; President Roosevelt

does not so regard it, nor does anyone else. Still, it is infinitely more than nothing. The President's theory is that he can in time lure capital into making a new and rich investment, the said investment being the payment of a living wage. He admits that the wage at present provided is not economically "sufficient."

As Administrator Johnson is said to have expressed the case, corporations, instead of putting their funds in increased stocks of goods, ought to invest them in the form of increased wages for labor. Otherwise, we shall again have warehouses full of stocks, and a people with no money to buy them. The unescapable need of the present moment is more purchasing power, as widely distributed as possible. The only way in which that power can be created is through the payment of higher wages to more workers.

This is not the same as taking the money out of your left-hand pocket and putting it into your right. It is, rather, taking your money and putting some of it in the worker's pocket, with the hope that it will bring in a larger return than when kept in either of your own pockets. When the current wage for automobile workers was two dollars, Henry Ford raised it to five, so that he could sell more automobiles. "He put into the pockets of labor purchasing power which would later come out to buy automobiles," writes Mark Sullivan. "In Mr. Ford's case, it worked." Perhaps it will also work under our new code system. In any case, it is worth trying, for it is sure death to stand still and wait.

If these plans work out, future codes, should they be deemed necessary, will include the payment to all employees of a true living wage. President Roosevelt makes this plain in the third paragraph of his memorandum, and it ought to be quoted here for the sake of the record:

Approval of the minimum wages proposed by the code is not to be regarded as approval of their economic sufficiency, but is granted in the belief that, in view of the large increase in wage payments provided by the code, any higher minimum at this time might react to reduce consumption and employment, and on the understanding that if and as conditions improve, the subject may be reopened with a view to increasing them.

From the outset, the textile industry will be required to submit regular reports on wages, hours, production, and consumption. It will also be required to develop statistical accounting, credit and other controls, and to give much attention to long-time planning and to similar

methods which, had common sense ruled American industrialism, would have been adopted long ago, not only to stabilize labor, but in the interests of the investment itself. Obviously, this complicated, although not in itself particularly difficult, scheme will fail absolutely unless two factors can be secured. The first is an intelligent administration by the Government, and the second is co-operation by the industry.

Laws do not execute themselves, no matter how exalted and beneficent their purpose. Practically, any Government is a group of politicians, and every law is just so much ink and paper. According to Ernest K. Lindley, Washington correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune*, firms and individuals who are ready to violate the rules of fair competition, and to enter upon a campaign of profiteering, are already winning the attention of Attorney General Cummings. Two weeks ago, the Secretary of Agriculture complained of unwarranted increases in the price of bread, and he is now checking the story that evasion is taking the form of reducing the weight of the loaves. That the Federal Government is listing bread prices in New York, and weighing loaves of bread in Iowa, is a vivid illustration not only of the vast extension of Federal power under the Recovery Act, but also of the tremendous burdens which the Federal Government is trying to carry.

The constitutionality of the Act must be considered quite apart from the benefits (and they are many) which it seeks to confer. If the President resolutely uses his great powers to enjoin codes on all industries, will the Supreme Court sustain him? Administrator Johnson, it will be remembered, has already been forced to reject three codes presented by the industrial steel operators, and one by the oil men, and there is some reason for the suspicion that these particular industries do not take the Act seriously. What is more to the immediate point, perhaps, will Congress sustain him next Winter? These are debated questions, but the address of Donald R. Richberg, general counsel for the National Recovery Administration, given at the Merchants' Association dinner in New York on July 6, throws no light on the first question. The gist of his argument was that "there exists no constitutional right to do any of the things forbidden by this law," and he added by way of specification, "there is no constitutional right to compete unfairly."

That, of course, is perfectly true, but I am loath to believe that Mr. Richberg, for whose work and ability I have high respect, will himself deem that statement a satisfactory solution of the constitutional issue. The issue is not, surely, that "there exists no constitutional right" to do certain things, but, rather, "What authority does the Constitution vest in Congress to forbid them?" I have no constitutional right to compete unfairly, neither have I any constitutional right to take my neighbor's watch, or to operate my raucous radio at two in the morning, or to keep a pig in the basement of my home. It does not follow, however, that Congress is authorized by the Constitution to regulate my conduct in these respects.

## With Scrip and Staff

IN all the discussion about tariffs, someone might question the wisdom, not to say the justice, of the duties which now are laid upon religious articles imported into the United States. As our parish priests know, who have imported such objects, the duties are onerous; and the exemption difficult of attainment, since it is restricted to goods expressly given by a benefactor of the church for specific purposes of worship. It is distinct news to learn that Greece, which has enjoyed no reputation of over-love for things Catholic, is liberal in this regard. Offerings, candles, and sacred objects destined for cult are exempted from customs duty. This, says Bishop Calavassi, is "a condition truly to be envied by the Catholics of many countries."

Recently Bishop Calavassi granted an interview to the representative in Rome of the N. C. W. C. News Service. The Most Rev. George Calavassi is the Ordinary for the Catholics in Greece of the Byzantine Rite, or, to use his own Greek phrase, the "Hellenorhythmic Catholics" of that land. Well, the Hellenorhythmic Catholics have had some stormy times since the Bishop was appointed as their Shepherd. The Orthodox Archbishop of Athens, Msgr. Chrysostom Papadopoulos, took frantic offense at the presence in his territory of Catholics of his own rite, yet in communion with the Holy See. Strangely enough, his recriminations began as a sequel to condolences offered to the Metropolitan by Bishop Calavassi, when a dastardly attempt had been made upon Msgr. Chrysostom's life. Bishop Calavassi replied mildly and courteously, and an historic interchange of letters developed.

The Catholic press in various countries took up the affair, and the Greek Orthodox press reacted by a press campaign of extraordinary bitterness and duration. The Athens *Ekklesia* spoke of Bishop Calavassi's work among the orphans and refugees as forming "a cowardly troupe of proselytes," and called on all good Greeks "to avenge the calumnies against the Head of the Greek Church, emanating from different European journals, such as the *Figaro*, *La Croix*, *Universe*, [London] *Tablet*, *Germania*, *Leipziger Neueste Nachrichten*, etc."

Addressing his flock, at Easter, 1929, the Catholic Bishop exhorted them to patience. "They do us wrong," he said, "and you with us, in saying that we have come into our own country in order to sow trouble and discord. They do us wrong, in accusing us of buying your consciences. They reproach Our Holy Mother, the Catholic Church; they reproach the Holy Father in Rome. But what are all these reproaches to you who know the holiness of the Church, the loftiness of her teaching and morals?"

YET, says Bishop Calavassi, Greece today is thoroughly liberal in its attitude towards the Catholic Church. Religion itself is highly respected by the Government. Extremist and Communist elements have been



removed from school boards, and children are trained to observe the practice of their religion. When anti-Catholic zealots, even Cabinet Ministers make accusations against the Catholics, an appeal to the Government brings a square deal. Notable is the Bishop's declaration:

We must not forget that besides the right guaranteed of having freely our churches, our seminaries, our schools, and our works of charity, besides the absolute liberty of worship not only in church but also in public, the Catholic Church is recognized as a moral entity with right of possession according to canon law.

The Greek Orthodox laity, it has been remarked, are, as a group, more friendly to Catholicism than are the clergy.

WHICH pays, to be mild or to be militant? Bishop Calavassi was mildly militant, and has won his way. The Paris *La Croix* established a reputation for aggressive militancy; but has just celebrated, on June 19, of this year, the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation. When it appeared in 1883 with the notice in large type: "No Advertisements Received," its doom was foretold. It was said that the persistence of *La Croix* in carrying the picture of the crucified Christ on the upper left-hand corner of its front sheet, cost the paper 162,000 francs deficit in its second year, when a franc was a franc. But, said Father François Picard, the Assumptionist, who with Father Vincent dePaul Bailly presided over its origins, the paper lived by Faith; and obtained miracles.

THE young men of Nativity Parish, for Italians, in New York's East Side, have a Catholic Action group which flourishes at Christodora House, on Avenue B and Ninth Street. They believe in the genial approach, in order to get the Catholic message over to the public. According to their Year Book, they have been thoroughly successful, under the direction of Father Gabriel Zema, S.J., their Spiritual Director.

Another genial spirit, however, is Dr. Georg Moenius, the editor of the Munich Catholic weekly, *Allgemeine Rundschau*, known for its conciliatory tone. But today's mail brings me, instead of the usual copy of the A. R., merely the front outside page, dated June 21, with the following notice in place of the Table of Contents:

*Verbot der Zeitschrift "Allgemeine Rundschau."*

*Die Wochenschrift "Allgemeine Rundschau" wird auf die Dauer von drei Monaten, das ist bis einschliesslich 31. VIII. 1933, verboten.*

*Würzburg, den 3. Juni 1933.*

*Polizeidirektion.*

Translated into the American language this means:

"The weekly, *Allgemeine Rundschau*, is hereby verboten, suppressed, gagged, ki-yoed, or whatever you want, for the space of three months, till the end of August, 1933. If you do not like this, go to the Captain's desk in Würzburg and see what you get."

Big sympathies to the A. R. Some reflections recommended to those of our fellow-citizens who think that the millennium is coming in Germany. And an invitation to the editor to come to Avenue B—or Athens.

THE PILGRIM.

## Literature

### Learning to Write

FRANCIS TALBOT, S.J.

(The fifth in a series of articles on "Writing.")

GRANTED that one has the talent for writing, one is thereby no more a writer than the cocoon of a silkworm is a mandarin's robe or a chunk of marble is a bust of Cleopatra. Walking the streets today are hundreds of human beings who are natively equipped with the gifts that made a Shakespeare a Shakespeare and a Francis Thompson the creator of "The Hound of Heaven." These unrecognizable persons have powers within them that are never released in printed words. They have gold hidden away in them that is never mined for the market. And they have never a suspicion that they have the writer's talent, the reverse of so many others who attempt to write through the artificial stimulation of very tiny powers and the tremendous labor of mining the few grains of gold with which they have been endowed. Of those who have the authentic gift for authorship, only a thousandth per cent of one in a thousand will ever become writers.

Since I believe that a gracious Lord has strewn the natural gift of authorship promiscuously in the human race, I am never surprised when I hear that someone has suddenly discovered, like a prospector finding gold, that he can write a piece which an editor will accept for publication. I could well believe that any intelligent acquaintance of mine, whether he sells bonds, sweeps floors, or assists a bricklayer, could instantaneously and unaccountably blunder into the writer's profession. Little girls like Nathalia Crane, a few years ago, wrote books in the leisure they could steal from their grammar-school attendance. Ex-tramps, like Jim Tully, transcribed their road talk and were enabled to ride in Pullmans instead of gondolas. Pat O'Mara, so I learn from today's paper, has given up driving a taxi in Baltimore and is working on his third book. On all sides we are surrounded by embryonic authors. We may be thankful that the vast majority of them remain embryonic. However, since it is necessary that some of them should develop into writers, the question of how a person endowed with the talent can be directed in the serious cultivation of that talent must needs be lugged up.

That my own opinion in all that follows may be given preference, I state as a conviction that the art of writing cannot be taught; but it can be learned. With that point clarified, I allow others, for example, Robert Lynd, to make the profound pronouncement that "it should be possible to teach almost any human being not to write badly, though even this has not yet been done in spite of ten-thousand schoolmasters." He continues:

But to take an ordinary human being and teach him to write really well—that seems as impossible as to teach him to be a good painter. On the other hand, it ought to be possible to teach any human being of the docile age to be a better writer than he already is, and that is, perhaps, as much as any of the books of instruction on the art of writing aim at.

For ten years, now, I have hoarded a clipping from the Boston *Evening Transcript*, and have, perhaps, looked at it once or twice during that decade, when I was clipping-cleaning. I shall quote from it now and be glad to destroy it. John Jay Chapman, by whom I was once badly treated in an elevator twenty years ago, presumably because of my Roman collar, is the author of the document, which is, in reality, not very important despite the fact it has been hoarded so long. He laments that "during the last quarter of a century there has arisen both in England and in America a highly self-conscious, much-stimulated, highbrow, uplift, moral forward-movement in the direction of Learning How To Write." Mr. Chapman is aroused, for he exclaims: "Many, many pedagogues are today talking—and here's the main point—talking to eager youth and to conscientious middle-aged persons and telling them How To Write. I have been aghast at the whole phenomenon. . . ." With a charming lack of humor, he presents the situation magnificently:

Perhaps the inordinate multiplication of the populations of Europe and America during the last century is the cause of this invasion of the kingdom of letters by a horde half-clad and barbarous who are on the march toward Rome. The newly enfranchised have discovered literature. They want to learn. They insist on being taught. Every studio must be turned into an infant school. "Textbooks" is their cry. "Give us textbooks. Mr. Quiller Couch, show us how! Mr. Arnold Bennett, Mr. Chesterton, Mr. Anybody, get a desk and a blackboard; we want to write."

In view of the fact that the good and the bad of Mr. Chapman's essay are destined for the tin wastebasket, I had better preserve another sentence or two. "Certainly the literature of England had heretofore been supported by men who taught themselves how to write without knowing how they did it," he asserts. "They learned through their own natural vitality, through their passion for thought, and their curiosity about life." And later, commenting on the products of those who have consciously made themselves into writers, he declares:

. . . And as I follow the essays of various living authorities whose specialty is the English language, I pause much longer, and I think of Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Spenser; of Fielding, Smollett, and Scott; of Bunyan, Thackeray, Dickens, and Browning—those non-academic, self-taught children of genius who picked up their language here, there and everywhere, and who never "specialized" in English; for their English was just themselves, and a man does not "specialize" in himself.

Somewhat the same trend of thought is explored by John O'London in a dateless scrap that I have before me. "How to Write an Essay—I" is the title at the top. Before he has gone three lines, Mr. J. O'L., says very plainly, "I do not think that I can tell him or her how to write an essay." But in the very next column he finds that he can be helpful, in the following manner:

If I am asked how it is possible to write essays such as were written by Goldsmith, Dr. Johnson, Charles Lamb, Hazlitt, and are now being written by Mr. Augustine Birrell and Mr. E. V. Lucas, I can impart to you the whole secret and will make you a present of it. All that is necessary is to be a Goldsmith, a Hazlitt, a Birrell, or a Lucas. But I would add that it is much more important, and also much more possible, to be yourself.

"To be yourself," that is a cardinal principle for one who attempts to be a writer. Strangely, it is a thing too often forgot by those who presume to teach the young

to write. The pedagogue would instruct the aspirant to model himself in his writing upon a Goldsmith or a Hazlitt, upon a Macaulay or a Stevenson, upon a Chesterton or a Mencken. He would counsel him to study the great authors intensively and to assimilate their art and to make himself as like as possible to them. But that, to me, is quite the worst procedure for a young writer to follow. For the learner of writing too often succeeds in doing nothing more than burlesquing the great masterpieces and in acquiring no other art than that of performing the shoddy tricks of the masters. I am not hereby condemning certain methods of study and of imitation that are current in academic courses of English composition. I am stressing the principle that being yourself in learning to write is quite as essential as knowing yourself, according to the apex of Greek wisdom, in learning to live.

To be yourself, in writing, is a quality that most of us acquire only after we have been attempting to write for some lengthy time. If we are ourselves at too early a date, our writing is rather flabby and vapid, like the conversational content of a precocious adolescent. We must pass through an imitative period, and then through an assimilative period that emerges into a period of expressing second-hand notions, and then, finally, into a period of awakening in which we begin to find ourselves and to express ourselves. The art of learning to write, then, is the art of learning to be one's self. The writer should be like Chesterton, who, someone remarked, "grows more like himself every day."

Off-hand, and casually, I should decide that the best method for a person with the talent for writing to learn how to write is to go to college. I trust that I shall not be interpreted to mean that a talented young person will learn how to write in the English courses that he will be forced to take in college. Some time later, I may discourse on college and high-school English in a way that may not please the professional teacher. But for the moment, I can say most sincerely that a young man or woman ambitioning to be a writer need not be injured irremediably by the English that he learns in college. He can outlive it, and can eventually succeed in being himself in his writing. However, despite these English courses, attendance at college is the best preparation for a writer, for the simple reason that it normally teaches one something to say.

Far more essential for a writer-to-be than the English classes are the various other courses. Through philosophy, through the sciences, through history, through mathematics, through the ancient and the modern languages, the mind is pried open and enlarged, it is made flexible and becomes a workable organism, it is rendered capable of assimilating vast amounts of knowledge. The contention need neither be emphasized nor proved. It can be passed over with a mere statement. The person who would learn best how to write should attend a college in which there is a well-rounded curriculum of cultural studies. There, whatever natural talents he has for authorship will be trained and developed. There, he will acquire the knowledge that has been accumulating through



the centuries. There, he will be started on that road of self-education along which every writer progresses.

Perhaps I should modify a trifle the snide remarks I made a few lines back about the English courses in college. More must be said later about the methods of teaching English and the use of textbooks, but here my only purpose in touching upon the matter was the conviction that English courses, designed as they are for the generality of men and not specifically for the one who ambitions to devote his life to the anguish of authorship, are no more important in the development of the writer's talent than are the other cultural courses. Unless, of course, the professor of English is no mere pedagogue. If the professor be himself a creative artist, or even a journalist, he may be of some use in helping his student to become a writer. Otherwise, the student must labor on in his own pioneering development of his talents for writing. I am in full accord with the statements credited a few weeks ago to Professor B. J. R. Stolper, of Columbia University, when he said:

We need to put the artist into the school. He probably hasn't gone to a school of education and doesn't know the first thing about pedagogy, but he is the craftsman. The artist is the creator. He is the only one equipped to lead pupils in creative activities—not the pedagogue. No one but an artist should be allowed to teach art in its various forms, literature, music, poetry, painting.

Pondering back upon my own student days, I can affirm that the professors who were also authors producing were the ones who taught me whatever skill I have in writing. Furthermore, that those who taught English but never attempted to write English were a drawback in the development of whatever natural talent I had. My experience, I suspect, might bear formulation in a generalization to the following effect: English courses in college may be helpful in the development of authors if the professors in charge are practising authors; but if the professors are only teachers, if they never agonize over a poem and never are wildly wrought up about a short story and never pound their brain in order to bring logic into an essay or treatise, then their instructions will usually succeed in preventing a budding author from sprouting. Why so many masters of classroom English spread a blight over the seeds of talent existant in their students shall be touched upon lightly, I trust, hereafter in some of these inquiries into the mystery of authorship. For the moment, I would affirm that lectures on theory and propounding of rules will produce professors of English; but of themselves they will not create writers of anything but precise and deadly English.

The ideal preparation, nevertheless, for one who has the talent and the desire to become a professional writer of any sort is a course in a college of arts. He may not be taught to write but he will be taught to think and will acquire the background of knowledge and culture. He may actually be educated and yet be able to write, which is but a twist to a flippancy stated, I think, by Richard Aldington: "Professors are often educated, but are seldom able to write; authors, on the other hand, can frequently write, but are not often educated."

## REVIEWS

**Joseph Conrad: His Philosophy of Life.** By WM. WALLACE BANCROFT. Boston: The Stratford Company. \$1.50.

Conrad set forth no dogma. Unlike Dickens, Thackeray, Eliot, he had no "message." But in the attempt of his novels to "give the light of the gospel" as he saw it, he has left to the world a philosophy of life deep in its import. The purpose of Professor Bancroft's book is to reveal the central principle of this philosophy, thus he hopes to assist readers of Conrad "to discover a deeper and richer meaning in the works of this great comrade of our common life." He admirably accomplishes his purpose. His book will enable one to understand, in its extent and depth, the principle of Human Solidarity which is the dominant theme of Conrad's philosophy of life. Conrad has gone on record as saying, "I suspect that the aim of creation cannot be ethical at all. I would fondly believe that its object is purely spectacular." Yet, as Professor Bancroft well shows in a thorough study of Conrad's characters and themes, his truth to moral principle is unflinching. We may regret that Conrad's morality seems to be a morality without God, a "mysterious arrangement of merciless logic for a futile purpose," but let us rather fasten our attention on the positive good that is in him. After reading Professor Bancroft's book we can appreciate the significance of Conrad's boast: "It may have happened to me to sin against taste now and then, but apparently I have never sinned against the basic feelings and elementary convictions which make life possible to the mass of mankind. . . ." A far cry from Zola and some of his modern counterparts!

E. B. G.

**The Letters of D. H. Lawrence.** Edited with an Introduction by ALDOUS HUXLEY. New York: The Viking Press. \$5.00.

The intimate story of a man's life, as revealed by himself in letters to personal friends, usually constitutes an interesting, oftentimes an inspiring, study. There mind speaks to mind, heart to heart, with implicit trust and confidence on the one hand, and understanding sympathy and devotion on the other. In these letters, David Lawrence reveals himself with all the complexities and diversities of his sensitive, sensuous, and erotic being. Pragmatic in his conception of art, he was licentious in his method and manner of life. Personifying to a marked degree the modern criterion of conduct that what I want I ought to have, he talks glibly about love, and of having found it with another man's wife, and the mother of another man's children. Living his life of open adultery brazenly and complacently, he rhapsodizes his unholy and unlawful union by profaning the most sacred of all human relationships. Pricked by conscience occasionally, "Oh, that is the ghastly part of it. If only one didn't hurt so many people," he satisfies himself that it must be all right because he *wants* it. Writing on one occasion to his friend Edward Garnett, he treats him to a fantastic and blasphemous exegesis of the beginning of the Gospel of St. John that reveals him to be essentially of the earth, earthy. The book is pretentious, covering some 900 pages, and has an appreciative introduction by Aldous Huxley.

J. A. L.

**The Tragedy of Lynching.** By ARTHUR F. RAFFER, Ph. D. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press. \$2.50.

When Judge Marcus Kavanagh of Cook County, Ill., made the statement: "That is what ails American justice. In one hand she holds an intricate and rusty scales, but she has lost her sword," there was nothing to prove that he had lynchings particularly in mind. But even if such were the case, there would be no reason for changing the statement in any manner, since in comparison with that other great, and nowadays so common type of unauthorized killing, the lyncher makes of the gangster a tyro in every respect save in the number of victims "taken for a ride." This fact, along "with the marked increase of lynching early in 1930," led to the "creation of the Southern Commission in the Study of Lynching" which was "fortunate to secure as its chief

of research and investigation Dr. Arthur F. Raper." Just how far the Commission was "fortunate" in this matter, is manifest throughout the pages of "The Tragedy of Lynching." By the clear marshaling of facts, whether they pertain to the victim in his guilt (?) and impotence, or to the police officials in their helplessness, tolerance, and even participation in such "murder," or finally, to the mob itself in its audacious usurpation of authority to which it has neither legal nor much less, moral right, Dr. Raper has constructed an unassailable thesis against a heinous crime we have too long ignored or of which we have thought too little. He has, moreover, made clear the effect of these outrages on the community wherein they occur, and the further effect on the country-at-large, inasmuch as the almost absolute immunity from punishment of the actual mob will always generate potential mobs, an almost necessary consequence unless "something is done." This last, the remedy, is also provided for by Dr. Raper, and in the morally certain efficacy of "his suggestions" he proves more conclusively than anywhere else in the book his clear, all-embracing, and far-sighted understanding of lynching in all its ramifications. Justice in America might well bow in reverence and gratitude to such a work, the acceptance of which will aid in retrieving "her sword" and refurbishing "her scales." R. P. L.

**The Odyssey of Cabeza de Vaca.** By MORRIS BISHOP. New York: The Century Company. \$3.00.

It is almost incredible that the epic of the first white man who crossed the North American continent from coast to coast should have waited so long to find its Homer. For in the career of Cabeza de Vaca, whose grandfather conquered the Grand Canary, are all the elements of drama. Landing on the coast of Florida, one of a band of 400 *conquistadores* seeking gold and glory, he saw the majority of his companions fall beneath hostile arrows, his leader become lost in the jungle, and the ships which brought the party to the mainland destroyed. Since retreat was impossible, De Vaca pushed on, feeling his way from Mobile Bay to the Mississippi, and from the Mississippi to Texas, where he endured seven years of slavery. Escaping with three comrades, one a Negro, he won a position of godhead with the tribes of Northern Mexico by performing prodigies of faith healing and was escorted from village to village to continue his beneficent labors. Slowly there formed in his cavalier mind a noble ambition. When he should return to the court of King Charles, he would ask the privilege of returning as governor to the land of his slavery, and there give an example of rule by honor and justice. In due time, he did return to Spain, received a commission as governor of Rio de la Plata in South America and attempted to bring his ideal to realization. Wicked subordinates thwarted his purposes as well as the success of his adventure into the Chaco wilderness. Loaded with chains and debt-ridden, like Columbus, De Vaca was transported back to Spain for trial by the Council of the Indies. In the meantime, his antagonists in South America succeeded where he had failed in making connection with the Spanish empire in Peru. The Council, overborne by a world of hostile testimony, found Cabeza de Vaca at fault and deprived him of office. His last years were clouded by debt and what he must have felt was dishonor. It was left for the Jesuits of Paraguay to establish the jungle Arcadia, of which the *conquistador* with the imagination of Coronado and the soul of Las Casas had dreamed. There are numerous passages which show how well the author has sensed the spirit of the Catholic faith, but there are others, where he misses it so badly as to talk of "pasty-faced priests," of monks who "patter through their Masses," of the "clerical privilege of miracle," and of the female followers of some "Jolly Friars." Apart from this flippancy and a failure to bring the scattered materials of the story into perfect focus, the brilliant young Cornell professor has done a notable service in calling attention to a hero well deserving a place with Cortez, De Soto, Coronado, and Pizarro and other intrepid heroes of the young Americas. J. F. T.

**Sun Yat-Sen Versus Communism.** By MAURICE WILLIAM. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company. \$5.00.

"Sun Yat-Sen Versus Communism" is a critique of the Triple Demism of the first President of the Chinese Republic. Coming as it does after the scholarly and scientific Catholic critique of the same book by the French Jesuit, Father Pascual d'Elia, it suffers somewhat by comparison. Its main thesis, that China has a right to the support of democratic nations, is deduced from the premises that China, in the person of Doctor Sun, and due to the influence of Mr. William's "Social Interpretation of History," (1) rejected Marx's materialistic conception of history in favor of William's social interpretation of history; (2) rejected the doctrine of class war in favor of William's four peaceful methods of economic advance, namely, "social and industrial reforms, public ownership of the means of transportation and communication, direct taxation, and governmental activity in the distribution of consumable wealth"; (3) rejected Marx's emphasis upon the producer and social control of production in favor of William's emphasis upon the consumer and social control of distribution; (4) rejected Bolshevik theories in favor of American. The author offers us still another indictment of Communism and of a government whose word is sans truth, sans honor, and sans sanction, thereby branding recognition of the Soviet as unreasonable, un-American, irreligious, and anti-Catholic. With this condemnation one can heartily agree. While the variegated and unscientific philosophizing of Doctor Sun slowly saps the reader's docility, the purposeful exposition of Mr. William's platform merits consideration and will provoke debate. T. J. F.

**Pioneer German Catholics in the American Colonies (1734-1784).** By REV. LAMBERT SCHROTT, O.S.B. **The Leopoldine Foundation and the Church in the United States (1829-1839).** By REV. THEODORE ROEMER, O. M. CAP. **United States Catholic Historical Society Monograph Series XIII.** New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society.

To Dr. Peter Guilday of the Catholic University must go the laurels of the pioneer, for to his indefatigable spirit the Catholics of the United States owe this remarkable renaissance of historical research which has brought to light most interesting details of the patriotism, loyalty, and contributions both moral and physical of the Catholics to the early development and prosperity of this country. Two of his scholars have prepared excellent studies for this number of the Monograph series. The Rev. Lambert Schrott, O.S.B., has taken up the detached threads in the story of "Pioneer German Catholics in the American Colonies (1734-1784)" and has woven a remarkable fabric which is the beginning of a tapestry which will shed glory on the Catholic Church and on those pioneers who brought with them from their Catholic homes the sacred traditions of the Faith and planted them on this soil with churches and schools while they were building the log cabins and clearing the wilderness. This is a comprehensive study and links together many scattered bits of Catholic history, giving a thrilling picture of the early German Catholics in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, with well deserved praise for the famous Jesuit missionaries, particularly Father Schneider and Father Farmer. The chapter on the pioneers in Louisiana is a sad story of hopeful dreams dashed on the rocks of painful realities, but it opens an investigation which if continued will show the power and influence of the Catholic Germans on the later developments of the Louisiana Purchase. The zeal of the Austrians and Germans at home for the spread of the Faith in the new colonies led to many gigantic and thoroughly practical organizations for help and relief, among which is the famous Leopoldine Foundation of Vienna which played such a vital part in supporting priests and church settlements in the United States. The Rev. Theodore Roemer, O. M. Cap., in the second monograph of the volume traces with careful accuracy the beginnings and development of this apostolic movement and with many important documents shows how the hierarchy and priests depended on this fruitful organization for the means to



carry on their work. The book is well printed on good paper in an attractive format, and is proof sufficient of the careful labors of the scholarly editor and historian, Thomas F. Meehan, whose untiring efforts have made possible the valuable Monograph Series.

F. D. S.

### BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Studies of the Negro.**—By some curious lapse of fortune, the situation of the 210,000 Negroes in New Jersey has been given less attention of recent years than in many States less favored by opportunity for research. To make up for this deficiency, on April 1, 1931, the New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies undertook, in cooperation with the Interracial Committee of the New Jersey Conference of Social Work, a survey project through sixty selected communities of the State. Investigators interviewed 2,162 Negro families in forty-seven communities of the State. The results of this survey are contained in "The Negro in New Jersey" (New Jersey Conference of Social Work, 21 Fulton St., Newark. \$1.00), and summarized in a highly graphic pamphlet, obtainable from the same agency, entitled "New Jersey's Twentieth Citizen." Dr. Ira De A. Reid, director of the research, and his collaborators, are to be congratulated on the skill and accuracy of their performance.

During a ten-week observatory trip in the largest centers of Negro population of the South and Mid-West, T. Arnold Hill and Jesse O. Thomas of the National Urban League Research Staff collected an abundance of significant facts concerning the situation of the Negro in the present depression, particularly with regard to unemployment and relief. These, together with many special reports and other interviews, are gathered up in the pamphlet, published by the League at 1133 Broadway, New York, entitled "The Forgotten Tenth" (35 cents). With regard to the latter, a sharp difference as to fair treatment was revealed between different individual localities, though not necessarily between different regions of the country.

Dr. Carter G. Woodson, editor of the *Journal of Negro History*, has made a deserved name for himself as a pioneer in the field of Negro history in the United States. He has embodied some of his reflections on things in general and the education of his race in particular, in "The Mis-Education of the Negro" (Washington, D. C. The Associated Publishers. \$2.00). His principal idea seems to be that expressed upon page 118: "The race needs workers, not leaders"; and his complaint that present Negro education produces neither. However, it is not altogether clear just what Dr. Woodson's concept either of workers or of leaders may be. His peculiar concept of "theology," which he finds to be of "pagan origin," leads him to the idea that theology defends social injustice. The value of Dr. Woodson's contribution would seem to be in some of his acute, but unrelated observations on life; its weakness, its lack of consistency.

**Forming Habits.**—Assuming an apparently revolutionary attitude to "the principles of learning as set forth in widely used texts," Dr. Knight Dunlap applies his own interpretation of the laws to the formation and breaking of habits in "Habits, Their Making and Unmaking" (Liveright. \$3.00). The new feature of his book is the emphasis placed upon "negative practise" in the breaking of undesirable habits; i. e., deliberately performing the habitual act, when the impulse to do so is not present, with the intention of conquering the habit and with assurance of victory. "Negative practise" may be of service in such involuntary acts as stammering, but when the same method is approved of, albeit cautiously, for the treatment of wrong sexual habits, a decided and general protest is necessary. Fortunately, the book is too technical, in parts, for the non-professional reader; unfortunately, the ethical outlook mars an otherwise valuable book.

**The Mass.**—There are many communities in the United States where Catholic children do not have the opportunity of learning much more than their catechism. Even in those localities

where they do, as Louise Doran Ross states in the preface of her new book, "The Eternal Sacrifice" (Catholic Education Press. \$1.25), there should be a period for meditative study of the Mass. The reading of such a book as this is an inspiration to young and to old who have the gift of faith, and should be enlightening to those of other creeds who wish to know something of the richness and beauty of the liturgy with which the Church surrounds the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

**For the Moralists.**—The researches of Drs. Ogino (Japan) and Knaus (Austria) have rightly demanded attention from their fellow physicians and from theologians. Their findings have large bearing on moral birth control. For a fuller understanding of this highly important question, a useful book has been just published, "The Sterile Period in Family Life" (Wagner), by V. Rev. Canon Valère J. Coucke, Professor of Moral Theology, Grand Seminary of Burges, and Dr. James J. Walsh. Both authors are clear in their exposition, yet brief. Dr. Walsh comments thus on the discovery: "Nature apparently intended that this law should be discovered in the course of time when population was increasing rapidly and then furnish the perfectly natural method by which would be brought about such limitation of births as would keep the world from being overcrowded" (p. 38).

**Textbooks.**—In "Ecclesiastical Greek for Beginners" (Benziger. \$1.75), Miss J. E. Lowe, M.A., has done a most useful service to young seminarians and others who are anxious to get as easily as possible a reading knowledge of the New Testament and Patristic writings. The author has included everything that is really essential and the exercises are most skilfully arranged. A Key to the work may be obtained for \$1.10. In view of the present interest in the Eastern Church, a work like this takes on an added value.

New methods successfully used in learning modern languages form the basis of learning Latin in "The Living Language" (Heath. \$1.36), by Wilbert Lester Carr and George Depue Hadzsits. The pupil begins Latin by learning Latin, much after the manner in which an immigrant to this country learns English. It is a welcome First Latin book, and most aptly named.

The students of our theological seminaries being now required to handle Biblical Greek as one of their auxiliary studies, Father Ignatius Errandonea, S.J., has come to their aid with his "Epitome Grammaticae Graeco-Biblicae" (Gregorian University. 7 lire). Within the brief space of 116 pages has been included all the grammar required for appreciating the differences between classical and biblical Greek. Though the desire for brevity sometimes makes the reading rather laborious, the treatment in general is clear and orderly, the divisions being set off by prominent type that makes ready reference easy. An Appendix supplies the usual paradigms of the classical declensions and conjugations.

**Books Received.**—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

BOTANY: PLANTS AND GARDENING. \$3.00. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.  
BUDGETOURING EUROPE. Janet Ross and Louise Franklin. 50 cents. *Uns.*  
DAYS OF EIGHTY-NINE. THE. Albert Fernandes. \$1.50. *Meador*.  
DUKE COMES BACK, THE. Lucian Cary. \$1.75. *Doubleday, Doran*.  
EDUCATIONAL LECTURES. Rev. P. C. Yorke, D.D. \$1.50. *Text Book Publishing Company*.  
ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, VOL. 10. Edited by Edwin R. A. Seligman. \$7.50. *Macmillan*.  
GOLDEN BOAT. THE. Rabindranath Tagore. \$1.40. *Macmillan*.  
LABOR ECONOMICS AND LABOR PROBLEMS. Dale Yoder. \$3.50. *McGraw-Hill*.  
LIBRARY AND ITS HOME, THE. Selected by Gertrude Gilbert Drury. \$2.75. *Wilson*.  
LIVES OF THE SAINTS, THE. VOL. VIII. Rev. Alban Butler. \$2.75. *Kenedy*.  
MASS EXPLAINED TO CHILDREN, THE. Dr. Maria Montessori. \$1.00. *Sheed and Ward*.  
MY BIRDS. W. H. Davies. \$1.25. *Peter Smith*.  
NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RECOVERY ACT, THE: AN ANALYSIS. Benjamin S. Kirsh and Harold R. Shapiro. \$2.50. *Central Book Company*.  
NEW DICTIONARY FOR NURSES, A. Compiled by Lois Oakes and Thomas B. Davie. \$1.00. *Reilly*.  
OLD IRISH LOVE OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, THE. Rev. James F. Cassidy. 2/6. *Gill*.  
OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION, AN. Merritt M. Thompson, Ph.D. 75 cents. *Barnes and Noble*.  
POCKET MEDICAL DICTIONARY, A. Compiled by Lois Oakes and Thomas B. Davie. \$1.00. *Reilly*.

**The Incompetents. The American Gun Mystery. One Way to Stop a Panic. Not to Eat, Not for Love.**

As a psychological study, "The Incompetents" (Knopf. \$2.35), by R. E. Spencer, has much to recommend it; as a story it will be quite satisfying to those who seek mental rather than nervous thrills. Mercifully sparing us both the assumption and the jargon of the psychoanalyst, Mr. Spencer gets to the roots of a family relationship; and it appears that when you get to the roots of the simplest family row, you find something very complicated indeed. It is a carefully written book and demands careful reading. Mr. Spencer, concerned only with the hidden springs of character that make for harmony or conflict in human relationships, studiously indifferent to elements of time, place, and event, except in so far as they are necessary to carry his family group forward, addresses himself solely to the reader who wants to see the wheels of the soul go round. And his "incompetents" emerge as persons pitifully true to life.

The Ellery Queen mystery stories seem to be going around the world. So far we have had Egyptian, Greek, Dutch, French, and Roman. Now it's American and 100-per-cent American in "The American Gun Mystery" (Stokes. \$2.00). A rodeo in the new Colosseum in New York just off Broadway; death rides with the rodeo before the eyes of 20,000 spectators and movie-camera men who without any warning film a murder. Your mystery-story addict has a taste that is easily jaded, over-exacting, and highly critical all at once. For such the author sends along a pamphlet that explains enough of his technique to lay down a fair challenge to the reader. Unraveling the plot then becomes a game, the reader's wit alert at every turn, confident that the author will play fair, give adequate clues to solve the plot which, he promises, has but one solution and one criminal. Without the candid challenge to match wits the story might not be fully satisfactory or convincing to the honest fan who wants his mystery straight.

Writers who have gained quite a reputation for their humor, and hence are in vogue for the time being, are perhaps more handicapped than other authors because they, like the King's Jester, must crack their quips at the bidding of another whether they feel in the mood or not. Irvin S. Cobb is America's jester par excellence, but he must ply his art when his publishers call, so there is little wonder that his output is not always up to his best. "One Way to Stop a Panic" (McBride. \$2.00) is by no means equal to some of his earlier writings, despite the fulsome praise found in the blurb. It contains six sketches, each with its own little preface. The prefaces, by the way, are little gems. If it be true that "our sincerest laughter with some pain is fraught" Mr. Cobb's best in the book is achieved when he wrote "Curses on the Letter Carrier," in which is told again but in a different light the story of a well-known actress slightly veiled beneath the fiction of the story. Then too one must not fail to mention the delightful irony of "Costume Jewelry." This may be said with untinted praise: there is not a shady joke or innuendo from the first to the last page.

Universities give courses in the technique of novel writing for just such promising writers as George Anthony Weller who has a sweeping hand for collecting material but no muscle for raising the structure of a novel. He attempts to write a tale of modern Harvard College life, "Not to Eat, Not for Love" (Smith and Haas. \$2.50), but drifts into irrelevant chapters on the aspects of college life—athletics, exams, prom. dances, room-mating, etc., with only the casual fluctuations of a romance between Epes Todd and Ellen Thwyte, to offer character relief. Incidents are powerfully dramatized, many scenes are sharply vivid, but they have no curve toward totality, toward rounding out the contours of a novel. Every novel should hatch a plot either of incident or character; the tonnage of detail in this book destroys what there is of plot. The lackadaisical title, taken from Emerson's diary describing the purposelessness of snakes, is a clue to the episodic contents. Staunch collegians might enjoy this book; yet even they will demand a technique to secure its parts.

## Communications

*Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.*

### Congregational Singing

To the Editor of AMERICA:

From time to time we read articles of interest to Church musicians in your splendid Catholic Review. In one of these articles Gregorian Chant was characterized as "a pagan device for the memory," an imputation that is seriously resented. An article in your most recent issue deals with congregational singing. This article was conceived with a constructive idea in mind and yet a general tone of pessimism pervades the entire article. I am taking the liberty of calling your attention to congregational activity in one diocese only, knowing full well that similar efforts are being made in at least five other dioceses. In the Cincinnati Archdiocese the Most Rev. Archbishop John T. McNicholas has made this the corner-stone upon which all musical activity of a liturgical nature is based. He does not hesitate either in public or private to reiterate constantly this fundamental idea. Based upon this idea we find congregational singing is developed at both the major and minor seminaries as a complement to the entire liturgical development. Practical ideas of applying this to parish activities are given to the students.

At the Teachers' College, the subject of congregational singing is one of the basic ideas of the school music course as well as the course for organists. In the course of study for elementary schools, congregational singing begins in the fourth grade, and a theoretical and practical course in chant is obtained in the seventh and eighth grades. Bi-annually, there is a diocesan adoption of a modern unison Mass, that is studied throughout the archdiocese. In every diocesan high school, a unison Mass is studied annually. There is congregational singing in every mother-house and novitiate with a specialist in charge. The activity of congregational singing is but one phase of a general liturgical activity, that embraces study of the Mass, the Missal, and evaluation of the Liturgy as the truths of the Church in action.

On Easter Sunday, the Congregations of the Cathedral, of Christ the King, of Guardian Angels, and St. Monica churches sang the Mass. Every morning during the week there is congregational singing at St. Mary, St. Martin, St. Lawrence, St. Monica, St. William, the Cathedral, St. Francis de Sales, to mention just those that come readily to mind. This is not only true of week-day Masses but also of Corpus Christi and Forty-Hour celebrations.

This liturgical development has reached splendid proportions at several academies and high schools, the most notable of which are: St. Ursula, Seton, Our Lady of the Angels, and at Notre Dame on Sixth Street. In the first-mentioned institution even the Propers of the Mass are sung congregationally. The Newman Club, a member of the national society of Catholic students of secular universities, sings the Mass congregationally, and once annually, on Easter Sunday, sings the Vespers of the day, entirely in chant; the complete ceremony of the Sanctuary accompanies this service. Children of all elementary and high schools must be ready at all times to participate in a general Mass celebration for diocesan functions. At one of these Masses, 11,000 sang the Mass with 200 Seminarians singing the Propers. Five hundred high-school students will sing the Mass at the opening of the National Convention of the Catholic Students Mission Crusade in August, in spite of vacation difficulties.

All of this activity must be correlated to the idea of general congregational activity in liturgical affairs, being one phase of Catholic Action, of community thought and activity, having an evident sociological effect, so popular today, but transcending all



is the restoration of the service to the people. The principle that congregations be active participants and not merely auditors has been a principle of the Archdiocese for the past eight years. From the Superintendent of Education down to the youngest grade teacher, this is the basic idea of music activity. We realize that it is an arduous task but that the results will be far reaching. Cincinnati.

JOHN J. FEHRING.  
Supervisor of Music.

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Father LaFarge suggests the beginnings of a tradition in his very timely article, "Shall the People Sing at Mass?" The foundation of that tradition should be laid in childhood, more specifically in the children's choir, which may easily include the total enrolment of parish or school. Granted that the religious angle or motive is the all-important element in the matter, the cause is hopeless unless some training in the fundamentals of music is included. By that I mean training in all the little details of pronunciation, enunciation, and the technic of singing well and intelligently. Without some attention—may I say, without considerable attention—to these none-too-poetical factors, communal singing falls into the same category as the indistinct murmurs of some sort occasionally heard when the people answer the prayers at the foot of the altar.

The problem is not so simple as Father LaFarge would have us believe, and those who have set themselves to accomplish the task have no misconceptions as to its practicability. We haven't the tradition in this country, we haven't the custom nor the habit found among other people of congregational singing. In other words, we can't talk about restoring the religious motive for singing among Americans until we have a foundation upon which to rest it. That foundation will only come into realization when the present generation of children and their successors are trained in the rudiments of intelligent singing, Gregorian chant, the pronunciation and meaning of Latin, and the rest of it. Then, perhaps—I'm not an optimist in the matter—communal singing will become the integral beautiful part of public worship that it should be.

Milwaukee.

HARRY F. BOLTON.

### The Jews and Germany

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

Permit me to refer to the letter in the issue of AMERICA for June 17 signed by Rebecca Hoar and headed "Jewish Communist World Revolution."

The accusation that the Jews of the world are in an international conspiracy to overthrow the world has of course particular reference to the situation in Germany where the alibi of the Nazis is that they are doing the world a service by overthrowing Communism and, more particularly, overthrowing Jewish Communism. This also happens to be the foundation of the Nazi propaganda in this country and other countries. The Nazis are doing an immense favor to the world by sending over propaganda agents who attempt to incite the general population against the Jews by assuming, first of all, that all Communists are Jews and, secondly, by insinuating that the Jews have one purpose in life and that is to overthrow all the existing governments and set up a Communistic regime in their place.

I should like, first of all, to echo the warning given by Michael Williams, the noted Catholic editor, who has asked Americans to beware of Nazi propaganda agents, both paid and unpaid, in this country. Let all civilized, wide-awake individuals beware of an insidious propaganda of hatred that the Nazis in Germany are attempting to spread throughout the world. Let all civilized people face the candid fact that in order for the Nazis to justify their own merciless, anti-Semitic program in the face of powerful protest, both Jewish and non-Jewish, it is necessary to discredit the Jews of the world as a whole, and to get the populations of the various countries to turn against the Jews.

It is the argument of apologists for the Nazi regime that their hatred of the Jews is political. This sentiment was recently echoed by Dr. Hans Luther, the German Ambassador. The Nazis, in other words, hate the Jews because they are alleged to be Communists. Let us, however, examine this argument very carefully.

The German elections of two years ago give a particularly striking instance of the nature of the political allegiance of German Jews and will be of interest to Catholics because they were concerned. In these elections, the Jews found themselves in an unprecedented position. They did not know for whom to vote. The Democrats, the party the Jews usually voted for, were incorporated into the newly formed State party, which was created to counteract the National Socialists. But it soon proved that this coalition would never accomplish anything alone—that another coalition was necessary. For this purpose the leaders of the State party turned to the Right and consummated a fusion with the *Jungdeutscher* party. The Young Germans, however, were very much suspected of being anti-Semitic but, in order to get the Jewish vote, they promised not to taint their program with anti-Semitism. For a time the Jews were satisfied, but when the election platform of the State party was promulgated, Jewry stood aghast. It pleased the Young Germans for whom it was intended, but the Jews were convinced that by voting for the State party they were voting for anti-Semitism. They had no alternative, however, as they did not care to vote Social-Democrat or Communist. Then to the rescue came the Centrum party, the great Catholic political party. No one but Catholics ever voted for it, none but Catholics ever ran on its ticket. And this party, for the first time, placed a Jew on its list of candidates, George Kareski, the leader of Berlin Jewry. The Catholics gave the Jews a chance to get out of an embarrassing dilemma—by voting Catholic!

This particular case is certainly not indicative of Communist activity among the German Jews. There are 600,000 Jews in Germany, about half of which are under voting age. Assuming for argument's sake that the 300,000 of voting age all voted Communist, what about the remaining 4,500,000 that voted Communist in the recent German elections? Were they also Jews?

The enemies of the Jews can always produce documents (such as the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" which have been proved to be palpable forgeries) which attempt to show that the Jews, since time immemorial, have had a whim for overthrowing the world, and there will always be a bigoted and ignorant group of people who will believe the anti-Semites, no matter how much evidence there is to the contrary. Yet no one can produce evidence that the Jews vote this way or that way. The truth of the matter is that the Jews are as divided on political, social, and economic questions as are any other group. They are Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, Fascists, yes, and there are even Jewish Communists. But it is palpably unjust to say that Communism is a Jewish movement or that any other political philosophy is exclusively propagated by Jews. The only generalization that can be applied to the Jews as a whole is that they are democrats, whether this democracy takes the form of adherence to the Republican, Democratic, Socialist, or any other democratic party.

The anti-Semite, however, hates the Jew and not his principles. He is, in consequence, sometimes a trifle illogical and inconsistent. He accuses the Jew of a Capitalist conspiracy to rule the world and in the same breath of a Communist conspiracy to overthrow the world. He accuses the Jew of being a pacifist and at the same time of being responsible for wars. He charges the Jew with being too numerous in the high places of government and at once with being unpatriotic and unwilling to take part in the government of his land. The literature of anti-Semitism makes fascinating reading for the student of perverted psychology.

Perhaps I should be less explicit to Catholics who themselves have, from time to time had to bear the sting of persecution. My plea to Catholics is that they turn a deaf ear to the propaganda of the Nazis or, for that matter, of any other element whose purpose is to stir up hatred in the world.

New York.

LOUIS MINSKY.

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—Industry received two strong warnings from the Government on the fair-competition codes. On July 6 Donald R. Richberg, general counsel of the National Industrial Recovery Administration, warned that industrial leadership was now getting "one more chance—perhaps the last—to justify its authority," and that if this opportunity were fumbled, political control tantamount to government dictation would be inevitable. General Johnson on July 7, referring to the possibility that increasing production unsupported by a broadened consumer buying power would lead to a reaction in business activity, warned that the Administration could take no responsibility for continuing the increase in production unless industry used the facilities of the Recovery Act to increase mass purchasing power. The first code to be accepted under the Act, that of the cotton-textile industry, was signed by the President on July 9, to be effective July 17. It will abolish child labor in the industry, establish a 40-hour work week, and fix minimum wages of \$12 weekly for the South and \$13 in the North. On July 11 a code for the lumber and timber manufactures industry was submitted, proposing a varied work schedule of 40, 44, and 48 hours per week, with minimum wages of 22½ to 45 cents an hour. On July 12 the electrical manufacturing and ship-building industries submitted codes, the former proposing a minimum wage of 35 cents an hour and a working week of 36 and 40 hours. The ship-building code suggests a minimum wage of 35 cents an hour in the South and 40 cents in the North, with a 40-hour work week. Because of the delay in submitting codes, the President had under consideration on July 12 a blanket order fixing minimum wages and maximum hours for industry pending the completion of trade agreements. To speed progress of the recovery program, he created on July 11 a council to coordinate the activities and direct the policies of national rehabilitation. It consisted of all Cabinet members and administrators of special Federal agencies set up by Congress. It will meet each Tuesday in place of the regular Cabinet meeting, and was designed as essential to the President's plan to get all the legislation into effect within the next month. On July 8 the President appointed Secretary Ickes Emergency Administrator of Public Works, where he will be responsible for the expenditure of \$3,300,000,000 for the construction of public works.

President Roosevelt threw the weight of his influence behind the repeal movement on July 8 in a telegram to the National Democratic Committeeman for Alabama, Leon McCord. In reply to a letter of inquiry, he cited the repeal plank of the Democratic platform, and said he thought he had made it "abundantly clear that the platform of the Democratic party adopted last year should be carried out in so far as it lies in our power." On July 12 the President signed an executive order requiring civil-service examinations of all applicants for postmaster-

ships, unless already qualified under civil service or regularly commissioned as postmasters, thus removing postmasterships to a considerable extent from political control. He asked Postmaster General Farley to draft legislation for the next session of Congress to include all postmasterships by law under the civil service.

In the first crop report this year on July 10, the Department of Agriculture predicted for 1933 the smallest supply of wheat in forty years and the smallest crop of oats ever recorded in the United States. Nevertheless, the Secretary of Agriculture decided not to alter the plan to reduce production because of the tendency toward increased plantings following a very short harvest. The time limit for cotton growers to accept the Government's acreage reduction plan ended at midnight, July 12. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration was reported confident that when final figures were available pledges for the destruction of 10,000,000 acres of cotton would be found, although on July 8 incomplete returns from fourteen of the sixteen cotton-producing States showed a total of 5,566,169 acres offered to the Government under the plan.

**All-India National Conference.**—Mahatma Gandhi, for the first time since his late hunger strike, made a public appearance at the National Conference held in Poona on July 13. The principal discussion was that of the abandonment of the civil-disobedience campaign carried on by the Nationalists under Mr. Gandhi's leadership. The Mahatma himself was in favor of the resolution to give up the campaign and to strike some means of accord with the British authorities. At the end of 1932, it was estimated that upwards of 20,000 Nationalists were in prison for taking part in the campaign of passive resistance against the British rule in India. The Government promised the release of political prisoners if the Nationalists gave over their civil-disobedience activities, but hitherto Gandhi has refused the offer. It was hoped that the proceedings of the present National Congress would prepare the way for cooperation of the Nationalists in the framing of the new Constitution for India which will be presented to the British Parliament next winter.

**World Conference Marks Time.**—When everything seemed to indicate that the World Economic Conference was on the point of adjournment it was saved from dissolution by the speech of Secretary Cordell Hull, leader of the American delegation, strongly backed by Prime Minister Bennett of Canada, representing the British Dominions on the bureau. The latter remarked that the delegates had come from thousands of miles away to discuss primarily how prices could be raised and that the Conference should not adjourn without even scratching the surface of this task. The gold bloc agreed to continue only on condition that monetary questions be excluded from the agenda. It was understood that this would not forestall discussion of indebtedness, central-bank measures and silver. Among other questions capable of consideration Secretary Hull listed: "Price levels.



credit policy, innumerable prohibitions and restrictions strangling mutually profitable trade transactions, retaliation and countless other war-breeding trade practices and methods." At the same time it was evident that the idea of worldwide action to control production, to reduce hours of labor and to increase wages in conjunction with currency management was becoming attractive and gaining recruits. In fact, the French delegation, leader of the gold bloc, made an announcement, stressing the importance of public works "which would give an economic return" while helping to diminish unemployment and giving impetus to economic life. The Conference received a new shock, however, when Senator Key Pittman informed the technical committee of the subcommission on the reestablishment of a permanent international monetary standard that, in the opinion of the United States Federal Reserve Bank authorities, the time was not ripe to lay down rules for the future guidance of central banks. In the meantime the governors of the central banks of France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Poland, and Czechoslovakia agreed to a limited pooling of gold resources for mutual defense against gambling in exchange. Most indications were that the delegations were marking time with a view to judging the results of the National Recovery Act in the United States.

**Payment of Irish Loan.**—Second reading of the bill in regard to the proposed repayment of the Dail Eireann External Loan 1919-21, provoked a lively debate between the Ministers and Desmond Fitzgerald, Cumann na nGaedheal speaker. The bill, according to Sean MacEntee, Minister for Finance, gave authorization to repay to each subscriber to the loan the sum of \$1.25 for each dollar subscribed and "to take into account any payment made by the Receiver appointed by the Supreme Court of New York." The sums already paid were taken from the unexpended portions of the amount collected for the establishment of the Republic of Ireland. It was calculated that, in order to repay the balance of the subscribers' claims on that basis, and to pay all other subscribers in full, the sum of £1,200,000 would be required. The present bill authorized the issue of a sum of £1,500,000, the balance being required to cover such contingencies as the possible fluctuations of the rate of exchange. The appropriation would cover the repayment of the entire amount subscribed by each individual in the United States and the payment of twenty-five cents on the dollar as interest. Mr. Fitzgerald challenged the bill on the ground that the American courts decided that the Irish Free State was not responsible for the repayment of the money subscribed to the loan. According to the Dail report, "he said that as far as he could judge the present bill mulcted the people of £1,500,000 in order to put £100,000 into the pockets of the President." He was made to withdraw the latter statement, which was indignantly denied by Mr. de Valera. The President pointed out that the repayment was a moral obligation, and that this view was taken by the former Cumann na nGaedheal Government when it was in power and after the American decision. He stated that these

moneys were subscribed for the benefit of the Irish people to aid them in a life and death struggle, and that the people who subscribed them were entitled to get their money back.

**French Parliament Adjourns.**—Before adjourning, on July 8, the French Parliament rushed through a number of measures to the complete satisfaction of Premier Daladier and the Cabinet. The life of the French Cabinet was prolonged at least until the Chamber reconvenes in October. One of the most important bills passed, affecting a large number of United States exports to France, was the increase in the existing tariff rates from 30 to 150 per cent in sixty-four categories of imports. It was indicated that most of the French tariff increases were directed as retaliation for the recent rise in German duties. Statistics issued in the Official Journal reported that France has not benefited by the dollar's depreciation, having lost all the temporary advantages for industrial production, by neglecting to buy any large amount of raw material before the general rise in prices in the United States. Citing the strong position of the Treasury, Premier Daladier promised a balanced budget next year, after Joseph Caillaux, chairman of the Finance Commission, demanded that the flow of public expenditures be checked. "Measures will be proposed," said the Premier, "as soon as Parliament reassembles." The remaining measures were then rapidly voted upon. The following were the most important bills passed: (1) A plan for the reorganization of the French railways through Government cooperation with the companies; (2) the program for the reorganization of the French Line; (3) the wheat bill, fixing the minimum price at 115 francs, which on July 11, at the exchange rate, amounted to \$1.74 a bushel; (4) the wine bill, which relieved the social, political, and religious unrest in Algeria and Tunis because of the French prohibition on Tunisian wine shipments of the 1933 crop.

**Church Settlement in Germany.**—Much satisfaction was expressed at home and abroad over the settlement of the delicate question of the relation of the Government to the Catholic and Protestant Churches. On July 8, the concordat between the Holy See and Germany was initialed by Cardinal Pacelli, Papal Secretary of State, and Vice Chancellor von Papen. The agreement forbids the clergy to take part in politics and withdraws all Church support from the dissolved Center party. The Government recognizes Catholic Action as a non-political organization and guarantees its freedom of action in defending Catholic ideals. Catholics are placed on an equal basis with Protestants, sharing in all the privileges formerly enjoyed by the latter. Both President von Hindenburg and Chancellor Hitler sent special messages of congratulation to Von Papen, and the whole of Germany celebrated the event. On July 11 the new constitution of the German Evangelical Church was completed and unanimously adopted. It was officially proclaimed by Bishop Marahrens of Hanover who had been in opposi-

tion to Hitler's intrusion into church affairs. The Government, through Minister of the Interior Frick, sent an official statement commending the delegates on having achieved unity. Government sanction was expected within the week. It was generally believed that Hitler and the German Christians would yield in their demands to have Dr. Mueller made first Reichsbishop and that a compromise candidate would be selected who with special councils and committees would be responsible to the Government for the whole Protestant body in its efforts to cooperate with the ideals of the newly formed State.

**Austria-Hungary Relations.**—Chancellor Dollfuss seemed more secure in his effort to hold together under dictatorial powers the tattered remnant of what was once a large empire. Fettered by financial bankruptcy and torn asunder by bitter factions, disruption seemed imminent, but the strong measures of the Chancellor brought about a new enthusiasm for national pride and unity, and events were apparently favoring his efforts to preserve national independence. Supported by France in its efforts to stem the Nazi and Pan-German group, Austria was able to negotiate loans enough to carry on, and the prospects for better trade relations among the Danubian States and even with America were encouraging. The visit of Premier Goemboes to Vienna to cement friendly relations and to remove the evident mistrust which had arisen in Austria since the Premier's recent hurried trip to Germany where he conferred with Chancellor Hitler was significant. It was suspected that these negotiations might be hostile to the unity of Austria. The meeting of Dollfuss and Goemboes at this time was a happy one and the ancient friendliness was guaranteed. While there was no official statement of any new agreement or treaty in regard to political or customs union, signs and rumors reflected optimism. Premier Goemboes stressed the need of a Danubian policy particularly in the matter of economics and trade, and the importance of having Austria and Hungary present a united front.—The Government complained sharply to the International Broadcasting Union in regard to Nazi propaganda being sent over the air from German stations.

**Americans Jailed in Majorca.**—After repeated but futile appeals, made to the authorities at Barcelona for the provisional release of five Americans from the military prison at Palma, on the Island of Majorca, Ambassador Claude G. Bowers, on July 8, ordered Claude I. Dawson, United States Consul at Barcelona, to intercede with the Ministerial authorities in Madrid. The release was not effected. While stopping at the Palma Hotel, two of the prisoners were reported to have struck a Spanish Civil Guard whose admonition to make less noise was unheeded. The Civil Guard, the national police force in Spain, gave evidence that it was deeply interested in upholding its prestige and, with its great political influence, was determined that the five Americans be tried for a military offense by a court martial. Strenuous efforts to obtain liberty on bail for the Americans failed. Ambassador

Bowers lodged formal protests with Foreign Minister de Los Rios and made frantic appeals on the ground of common justice, stating that, even though the offense might be serious under the existing laws of Spain, the actual facts were not of a grave nature. The State and War Departments of the Spanish Republic assured Mr. Bowers that they would do everything possible to untangle the red tape of the military machinery.

**Pontiff Visits Castel Gandolfo.**—On July 10 the Holy Father left the city of Rome for the first time since elevated to the Papal throne. Without retinue or formal ceremony the Pope was motored to his villa at Castel Gandolfo, fifteen miles south of Rome, to inspect the improvements undertaken there in the last two years. The Papal party left the Vatican in the late afternoon in three automobiles with lowered blinds. Consequently, there was nothing to attract attention to the Papal cars and their passage was unnoticed. At Castel Gandolfo, however, news of the Pope's coming had leaked out and when he arrived the entire population of the village lined the road leading to the main entrance to the villa, applauding the presence of the Pope in his summer residence, a residence which no Pope had visited in sixty-three years. In and around the villa Pius XI spent several hours inspecting every detail of the renovations. After congratulating the architects and engineers on their skill he set out again for Vatican City, which he reached about nine o'clock.

**Portugal Shows Surplus.**—While it seemed almost impossible for nations to balance their budgets, Portugal for the fifth time showed a surplus which was the more remarkable since the tax on buildings had been reduced ten per cent.—Rumors have been spreading of unrest in political factions and of plots to overturn the Government. The escape of two officers who had recently been sent to prison as leaders of a conspiracy increased the fear of an uprising. The Government was taking strenuous measures to quiet the excitement.

Our dramatic critic takes no vacation while the theater is lulled for the summer. Next week Elizabeth Jordan will review the year's plays, the actors, and the settings, and makes her awards impartially.

Some weeks ago Spain went through its first serious ministerial crisis, and since then there has been silence. Next week Lawrence A. Fernsworth, our correspondent in Spain, will recount the curious events that reveal so much about the new Republic.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of which so much had been hoped, is fading away. Next week Floyd Anderson will read its funeral eulogy in "R. F. C.—R. I. P."

How a member of the Know Nothing party in Alabama fought his way in the political life of his State and then found his way into the Catholic Church will be told interestingly by Richard A. Purcell.